

122

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o VII. APRIL 1877.

ART. I.—PANTHEISM—FROM THE VEDAS TO
SPINOZA.

1. *Indian Wisdom, or Examples of the Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Doctrines of the Hindus.* By MONIER WILLIAMS, M.A., Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford. (London: Allen and Co., 1875.)
2. *Four Lectures delivered in substance to the Brahmos in Bombay and Poona.* By the Rev. NEHEMIAH GOREH, a converted Brahmin of Benares. (Bombay: Education Society's Press, Byculla, 1875.)
3. *The Aryan Witness.* By the Rev. K. M. BANNERJEA, Honorary Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Calcutta, &c. (Calcutta: Thacker, Spink, and Co.; London: Trübner and Co., 1875.)
4. *The Formation of Christendom.* Part Third. By T. W. ALLIES. (London: Longmans, 1875.)
5. *Pantheism.* By JOHN DOWNES, M.A. *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Eighth Edition). (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1856.)
6. *An Essay on Pantheism.* By the Rev. JOHN HUNT. (London: Longmans, 1866.)
7. *Cartesianism.* By Professor EDWARD CAIRD. *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Ninth Edition). (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1877.)
8. *Benedicti de Spinoza Opera quæ supersunt Omnia.* Ed. C. H. BRUDER. (Lipsiæ: 1846.)
9. *The Principles of Modern Pantheistic and Atheistic Philosophy, as exemplified in the last Works of Strauss and*

VOL. IV.—NO. VII.

B

370607

others. (A Paper read before the Victoria Institute.)
By the Rev. C. A. ROW, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's.
(London: Hardwicke, 1874.)

10. *Essay on Religious Philosophy.* By M. EMILE SAISSET.
Translated, with Critical Essays, marginal Analysis and
Notes. Two volumes. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1862.)

THE subject of Pantheism has been surveyed with so much of earnestness and of ability, both from the religious and the philosophical point of view, that we perhaps owe an apology to our readers for venturing to bring it before their notice. But although we cannot pretend to say much that is new, we would fain hope that it may be useful to collect from various quarters some statements and reflections on this ancient and wide-spread form of error. The plan which we propose to adopt is this. I. In the first place, we shall state briefly the Christian doctrine concerning God and the created universe, and contrast with it the doctrine known as Pantheism. II. We shall then glance at the forms which Pantheism has taken, (1) in India, (2) in Greece, and (3) in ancient Rome. III. It will, in the next place, be only just and right to notice some of the palliations fairly adducible on behalf of the erring teachers in heathendom, while at the same time we try to trace the injury wrought by the error itself intellectually, morally, and religiously. IV. It will then be necessary to speak of its revival in Christendom, with special reference to the remarkable man named in the title of this article. V. We may conclude with a few words of counsel and of warning, which, though of necessity extremely brief, may not, we trust, be wholly thrown away.

I. Christians believe in one Supreme Being, the solely self-existent substance, who is perfectly wise, perfectly good, perfectly powerful; excepting in so far as His attribute of power may be limited by His goodness, or by any other principles which are a portion of His Being, and wherein He is a law unto Himself. They believe Him to have existed from all eternity; and forasmuch as the co-existence of anything else (as, for instance, matter) without His leave, would be an infringement upon His almightiness, they hold that there was an eternity, when as yet created things were not, and He reigned alone; alone, but not solitary, for in the Oneness of the Godhead there was ever intercommunion in that triune nature between the three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

They believe that at a certain time, of His own free choice, He was pleased to create. How something could be

produced from nothing they may not pretend entirely to understand. It is justly, therefore, reckoned as an article of faith. As regards the exact method and order of creation, whether there has been anything like evolution and development, and, if so, within what limits, such problems must to a very large extent be regarded as a question for the investigation of men of science. But of mankind we are taught that it was made, that on earth it might serve and worship its Maker, and hereafter rejoice with Him in Heaven :

‘For adoration Thou endur’st ; endure
For consciousness the motions of Thy will ;
For apprehension those transcendent truths
Of the pure intellect, that stand as laws
(Submission constituting strength and power)
Even to Thy Being’s infinite Majesty !
This universe shall pass away—a work
Glorious ! because the shadow of Thy might,
A step, or link, for intercourse with Thee.’¹

The Creator is one ; things created are another, and can never become *of one substance* with Him, the Eternal Spirit who has made them. Such is throughout the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Church of God.

‘In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.’

‘Thou Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth ; and the heavens are the work of Thine hands ; they shall perish, but Thou remainest ; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment ; and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up and they shall be changed : but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall not fail.’

Therefore, when, under either dispensation, God’s servants have met together to celebrate some signal instance of His mercy, they are found, before commemorating the particular occasion wherein He has displayed His goodness, giving honour to God, as the Maker of the universe.² The same feature meets us in the Creeds of the Primitive Church. Not only the Apostles’ Creed and that of Nicæa, but likewise those preserved in the writings of Epiphanius and of S. Cyril, and indeed all those composed in the Greek language, begin with the confession of God as the Creator of all things visible and invisible. The work of redemption may be more marvellous than even that of creation, and come more closely home to heart and conscience. But creation precedes redemption, and is of course its necessary condition. Accordingly

¹ Wordsworth, *The Excursion*, book iv.

² See especially Chronicles xxix. 11 ; Nehemiah ix. 6 ; Acts iv. 24.

the Creeds, which (in strict accordance with Holy Scripture) began thus, were well and wisely framed ; and the West in this respect in due time followed the example set by the East.

Additional evidence for the wisdom of thus clearly enunciating the separation of the Creator from all creatures is supplied, if indeed it be needed, by events of our own time. Two men of this century have won for themselves celebrity by the elaborate nature of their attacks on the revelation of our manifested God, as set forth in the pages of the New Testament. But both Friedrich Strauss and Ernest Renan perceived that their assault must of necessity be based on a denial of the God revealed in the Old Testament. Strauss saw this the more clearly of the two ; and hence his *Leben Jesu* is a more philosophical and consistent book than the Frenchman's *Vie de Jésus*. Strauss, with a keen instinct—that sort of instinct which De Maistre has maintained to be infallible—devoted a page to a description of the God of Israel. It is a fair and even eloquent description, but it is made only to be repudiated, and the writer goes on to a distinct profession of Pantheism.

The Fathers of the Church, in this as in other respects, follow in the wake, as it were, of Holy Scripture and of the Creeds. Fine expressions on this grand theme abound in their writings. We must here be contented with a single sample. It is chosen in preference to others, partly because we have not seen it in treatises bearing on these subjects, as those of Canon Heurtley or Dr. Klee ; partly because it has been only recently recovered, and proceeds from one well versed in the philosophies of heathendom :

'The One God,' says S. Hippolytus, 'the first and only One, Maker and Lord of all things, had nothing coëval with Himself ; no boundless chaos, no measureless waste of waters or extent of barren land, no dense atmosphere, no glowing fire, no subtle breeze, nor blue vault of the mighty skies : but He endured alone, and by His will He made to exist things heretofore non-existent, save only that He willed to make them with full experience of what would result : for to Him belongeth foreknowledge also.'¹

Now it need not be said that on the relation of the

¹ Θεὸς εἷς, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ μόνος, καὶ ἀπάντων ποιητὴς καὶ κύριος, σύγχρονον ἄσχεον οὐδὲν, οὐ χάος ἀπειρον, οὐχ ὕδωρ ἀμέτρητον ἢ γῆν στερεάν, οὐχὶ αἶρα πυκνόν, οὐ πῦρ θερμόν, οὐ πνεῦμα λεπτόν, οὐκ οὐρανοῦ μεγάλου κτανέαν ὁροφὴν· ἀλλ' ἦν εἷς μόνος ἑαυτῷ, ὃς θελήσας ἐποίησε τὰ ὄντα οὐκ ὄντα πρότερον, πλην ὅτι ἠθέλησε ποιεῖν ὡς ἐμπειρος ὢν τῶν ἐσομένων, πάρεστι γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ πρόγνωσις.—S. Hippolyti Episc. et Mart. *Refutationes omnium Hæresium librorum decem quæ supersunt*—(Ed. Duncker et Schneidewin, Göttingæ 1859), lib. x. cap. 32.

Creator to the universe, not only Judaism, from which Christianity claims to have been developed, but also Mohammedanism, which has so largely borrowed from both, is at one with Christianity. In a word, a real Theism is the basis of what would probably be admitted by historians, and by those who try to take a calm and philosophic survey of facts, as the three most *energetic* Creeds known among mankind. Those who reject Monotheism must be either Atheists, Agnostics, Polytheists, or Pantheists. With Atheism and Agnosticism we are not at present concerned, but it will be necessary, in speaking of Pantheism, to make occasional reference to Polytheism.

II. Pantheism has been truly described as 'that speculative system which, by absolutely identifying the subject and object of thought, reduces all existence, mental and material, to phenomenal modifications of one eternal, self-existent Substance, which is called by the name of God.'¹ And, for practical purposes in the way of thought and study, we would suggest the following queries concerning any writer who is accused of Pantheism. Does he recognise a *Personal* God, a Father, as an object of adoration and of love? Does he plainly indicate his conviction that the creature can never become of one substance (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Creator? If these questions concerning a given author can safely be answered in the affirmative, then such author may indeed have used unguarded expressions, may have assigned to external nature functions beyond her power to fulfil, or have employed images respecting the life to come which will not bear a rigid interpretation, but he ought not to be charged with Pantheism.

We agree with the able writer, whose definition we have just cited, and with Mr. Hunt, that if this one substance, into which all things are merged by Pantheism, be proclaimed as matter, we then have materialistic Pantheism, which is only a particular species of materialism, and of which the proper corollary is sheer blank Atheism. But let us suppose—and it is only bare justice to admit that such an hypothesis is that of a vast number of Pantheistic systems—that the one

¹ This definition is the one given by Mr. Downes in his excellent article named at the head of this paper. We much prefer it to the Essay of Mr. Hunt, clever and learned as the latter is. In making a general acknowledgment of obligations to both authors, the writer would observe that in some places, where he may seem indebted to one or the other, he is only repeating remarks of his own made in an article on Pantheism in the *Ecclesiastic* of May 1846.

substance is regarded as Spirit. The further question, as Mr. Downes justly observes, will then emerge: 'Is this Deity, from whom all things are supposed to spring as *parts of Himself*, conceived of as exhausted or unexhausted in the act of producing the universe?' If he is exhausted, then the ultimate result is after all a material Pantheism, which may be summed up in the formula, *All things are God and God is all things*. But if he is regarded as unexhausted in the act of creation, the resultant creed is that of a spiritual Pantheism, of which the proper formula is, *All things are God, but God is not all things*. Sadly erroneous as is this latter form of creed, it is yet far less coarse and grovelling in its character than a purely materialistic Pantheism. Many who have held it in ignorance have not been far from the Kingdom of God; many, who have at one time of their career half unconsciously believed and taught it, have in later life proclaimed a true and real Monotheism. At least one great doctor of the Church, S. Augustine of Hippo, passed through it on his road from heathenism—for Manichæism may fairly be regarded as a species of Pantheism—and if some among the mystic theologians have been accused of it unjustly, yet the accusation has in other cases been only too well founded.

1. Although traces of such doctrine may be discerned in many regions and among widely scattered tribes, it is generally held, and we believe justly, that the classic land of Pantheism is Hindustan. On the leading features of that creed we find a remarkable concurrence of statement between the authors of the treatises named at the head of this article, and writers of a somewhat earlier date, as, for example, Mr. Morris and Mr. Rowland Williams in their respective prize essays, Professor Max Müller in his *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, and the authors of the able articles on these subjects in two of our most famous Encyclopædias.¹ Other authorities may be referred to in passing, but we must

¹ The proper titles of these works run respectively: 1. '*An Essay towards the Conversion of the learned and philosophical Hindus*. By the Rev. J. B. Morris, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.' (London: Rivingtons, 1843). 2. '*Paramēswara-jnyāna-gōshthī*. A Dialogue of the Knowledge of the Supreme Lord, in which are compared the claims of Christianity and Hinduism. By the Rev. Rowland Williams, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.' (Cambridge: Deightons, 1856.) 3. The articles in Chambers' *Encyclopædia* on 'Hinduism,' 'Transmigration,' &c., are very excellent and are referred to by Prof. Monier Williams; those in both the eighth and ninth editions of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* on Buddhism, &c. are at least equally so. See also Prof. Cowell on Buddhism in Smith and Wace's new *Dict. of Eccl. Biography*.

express special obligations to Father Goreh and Professor Monier Williams.

The devout and cultivated minds of India seem for many ages past to have devoted themselves to a contemplation, based on books revered as sacred, which led them to regard the visible universe as one vast dream. To escape from this dream by death, to become re-united to the Great Soul of the universe by loss of personality and complete absorption into it, and thus to see things in their true and real aspect—this was what the Hindus held to be the one sole object for which the wise should in this life yearn and strive. Such was the condition of Indian thought, as we learn from Megasthenes, at the time of the conquest of Alexander, about B.C. 327; and such has it remained down to a comparatively recent period.

It has been maintained by some, that traces of a real Monotheism may be found in the India of an earlier date. This is quite possible; but the teaching of the Vedas, though often vague and misty, appears to incline towards Pantheism; and a formalisation of such doctrine is ascribed to the sage Sankarāchārya, who is believed to have flourished about twelve hundred years ago.

The liberation from delusion thus aimed at is to be attained by contemplation, by penance, and by the general performance of duty. The souls of those, who fail to attain to it, suffer a transmigration into the body of some lower animal as a punishment. After passing through several of these, in proportion to the amount of chastisement required, the soul is again permitted to occupy the body of a man. Excepting in the case of the purified spirits, this process is ever being repeated, inasmuch as the individual soul of each is as eternal as the one Great Spirit of the universe. Neither has had any beginning, neither will have any end. The same must be said of the substance, whether real or illusory, out of which visible things were made. *Ex nihilo nihil fit* appears to be an axiom of philosophic Hinduism.

The soul can only act and will, when connected with some bodily form. But this bodily form is a source of bondage and of misery. Moreover, the acts committed by the soul in this condition cling to it, and must receive the due meed of punishment or of reward. And as each soul is clad in two bodies, a gross and a more subtle one, this subtle body abides with the soul in the heaven or hell, where bliss or bale is bestowed, and never leaves the soul until a final emancipation is effected. It is strange, however, that in its condition

of transmigrated being, the soul does not recollect what it did in a previous state. Consequently it may frequently be undergoing tribulation for offences utterly outside of its present range of knowledge. The direct road to the attainment of absorption lies in this world through abstinence from action, from love and hatred, and from likes and dislikes.

Now it must, we think, be obvious at a glance that such a creed as the above can only be intended for the few. The abstract character of its teaching is in itself an obstacle to its reception; and as for carrying it out into practice, how can the poor man, who must toil for his living, by any possibility abstain from action? Hindus would, we presume, fully admit the correctness of this statement, and the growth of caste, though it may not have originally formed part of the system, seems a very natural result of the doctrine.

Some approach towards a more concrete divinity is afforded by the following additional tenets. The one great spirit, the only real eternal essence, is known by the neuter noun Brahman. But this spirit has condescended to pass into actual manifested existence; and he then becomes Brahmā (noun masculine), the creator. Again, as developed in the world, he is Vishnu; and as again resolving himself into simple being, he is Siva. Yet, further, not only does the one universal spirit manifest himself thus, but he has connected himself with the forms of men and with myriads of intermediate beings, gods and demi-gods. These last are but finite beings; they are portions of a perishing universe; they feed on oblations, are liable to passions, and accordingly need penances. They have bodies dissoluble like those of men; and their souls must need suffer the like absorption into the supreme soul of all. Thus Hinduism may be described as spiritual Pantheism with a system of Polytheism annexed to it.

And hence arises a strange, and, so far as we can make out, an unique phenomenon in Hinduism. We have seen that the neuter spirit of the universe may become manifested as Brahmā, or as Vishnu. But in certain emergencies, Vishnu has condescended, for the sake of mankind, to take upon himself the body of an animal or a man. Thus we have (to employ the language of a distinguished convert from Hinduism to Christianity) 'a sort of incarnation of an incarnation.' Such a descent is known, as our readers are probably aware, as an Avātar. Nine Avātars have occurred already; a tenth and last is yet to come. Vishnu has appeared as a fish, as a tortoise, as a boar, as a man-lion, as a dwarf, as a member of the Brahmin (the priestly) caste; as a member of the

Kshatriya (the warrior) caste ; as 'the dark god' Krishna—a sort of Indian Phœbus-Apollo, very popular as an object of worship, and by some held to be not an incarnation of Vishnu, but Vishnu himself ;—as Buddha, regarded by Brahmins as a sceptical philosopher sent by way of chastisement. The latest Avâtar yet in store is to be Vishnu, who will appear as the god Kalki, or Kalkin, when the world is sunk in depravity, to destroy the wicked, to re-establish righteousness, and to renew the earth by the inauguration of a fresh age of purity.

Buddhism, arising some six centuries before the Christian era, was a protest against the caste system of Hinduism. It proclaimed a gentler and more kindly, perhaps we may say, a purer morality. On the other hand, it can scarcely be said to have had a *cultus* or special theology ; and its doctrine of Nirvana, as the end and aim of all true wisdom—whether Nirvana be regarded only as absolute quietism in the bosom of the soul of the universe, or actual annihilation—must be recognised as a form of Pantheism. For a long time Buddhism was looked upon by the Hindus as a school of philosophy rather than a rival creed. But its progress weakened the powers of the Brahmins, as indeed was inevitable. A life-and-death struggle ensued, and Buddhism was effectually banished from its original home in India to take refuge in Thibet and Mongolia, in China and Ceylon.¹

And now what reflections are suggested by this brief survey of Pantheism in its fullest sway ? Its weaknesses in theory and in practice will be touched upon hereafter ; but we earnestly desire, if possible, to be fair ; and the good points of the natives of India ought to be duly recognised.

It is evident, that the Greeks, who visited India, were very favourably impressed with its condition. Love of truth, great freedom from robbery and crimes of violence, simplicity, and temperance in eating and drinking, active and constant attention to the administration of justice on the part of their kings, struck these Western observers as prominent features of Indian life. If the austerities and penances employed seem in our eyes repulsive and superstitious, it must be remembered that (as has well been said) 'those who are not superstitious without the Gospel will not be religious with the Gospel ;'² and that such self-chastisement proved at least the reality of the sense of sin. The framework of legislation,—a legislation of much

¹ See, in addition to authorities already mentioned, Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum* (bk. i. chap. 2).

² J. H. Newman, in one of his Oxford (University) sermons.

merit and elaborateness—is entwined with religion; and the knowledge and recitation of the Veda is described as a means of cleansing the soul, and as the only proper path to the attainment of eminence in the army, in the state, or in kingship. The Hindus appear to have been of old a religious people, caring little for national greatness, but devoted to contemplation: and their creed inculcated deep respect for parents and for teachers, frequent alms-giving, and kindness not only to the poor, but also to the lower orders of creation. A contemporary critic in the *Athenæum* [No. 2574] maintains the permanence of these sentiments to our own day. Praising the truthfulness of the pictures of Hindoo life set forth in Mr. Allardyce's new tale, *The City of Sunshine*, the reviewer says:

‘Not love, nor ambition, nor chivalry in its many forms, will ever form the central spring of an Indian novel of the highest class. Religion is the “air, fire, water, and food” of the Asiatic. His sublimest love is fervidly sacred. The highest ambition, in his opinion, is that of the ascetic, who, by penance and wonderful sacrifices, can conquer even the greatest deities, and rule the three worlds. And deeds of bravery are always consecrated and crowned by religion.’

We take India as the palmry specimen of the prevalence of a Pantheistic creed in the East. Our limits will not permit us to inquire into the elements of Pantheism in other Oriental lands—as, for instance, in Persia, where the Zendavesta took the place occupied by the Veda in Hindustan. It must suffice to remind students of the way in which the father of Greek history describes the Persians as ridiculing the anthropomorphic creed of the Greeks, as sacrificing to the sun and the moon and the elements, and ‘acknowledging the firmament as God.’¹ This looks, to say the least, like a Pantheistic tinge in the religion of that really noble race. But it is time to turn our steps westward.

2. From India, then, we turn to Greece, which, in a literary and philosophical aspect, must of course be considered to include the colonies of the mother country, both in Asia Minor and in that southern part of Italy at one time known as *Magna Græcia*. Now at first sight Greece, more especially Greece proper, will naturally occur to the mind of an educated reader as the home of Polytheism rather than of Pantheism. Nor do we for a moment dispute the justice of a verdict based alike upon her literature and on the records of her polity, and sanctioned in our own century by writers of such varied temperament and training as Goethe and Schiller, as William

¹ τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Δία καλέοντες.—*Herodotus*, i. 131.

Wordsworth and Dr. Döllinger. Nevertheless, side by side with the polytheistic creed of the masses, along with that theogony of which Herodotus regarded Homer and Hesiod as the originators, there flourished various schools of philosophy, which, varying in form, were in most cases essentially Pantheistic in tone. We can only briefly glance at some of them.

The Ionian school, led by Thales (who was born B.C. 639 and lived to a great age), taught the existence of one single principle; and this principle they held to be *water*. This conception Aristotle attributes to the circumstance of Thales observing that all nourishment was moist, and that heat sprang from nourishment. Anaximenes and an early Diogenes, agreeing in the general creed, named *air*. Hippasus of Metapontum, and Heraclitus of Ephesus, proposed to substitute *fire*; while Empedocles made four coëval and primary principles, combining *earth* with the *water, air, and fire* of his predecessors. These philosophers must all be credited with the profession of materialistic Pantheism.

Anaxagoras, of Clazomenæ, earlier in date of his birth (B.C. 500), but subsequent to the above-named disciples of Thales, in point of authorship, took a loftier flight. He maintained that none of these (so-called) elements could be safely regarded as prior, or in anywise superior to the rest. He pronounced the cause of the universe, and of all its order, to be *mind*. Nevertheless, Anaxagoras, in common with the vast majority of heathen teachers, failed to rise to the idea of creation: for although he attributed to mind or intelligence (*νοῦς*) the arrangement of the universe, he supposed the matter on which mind acted to be pre-existent.¹ Thus, while opposing the materialistic teaching of Thales and the Ionic school in general, he yet fell short of a true Theism. As, however, unlike his predecessors, he attacked the popular Polytheism, which they had fully tolerated, he was forced to fly from Athens. Political enmity against his friend Pericles was certainly mixed up with at least one set of charges against him; but there seems no reason to doubt that his Agnostic language respecting the gods of the ordinary Greek pantheon was considered to be equivalent to Atheism.

Although Anaxagoras came to Athens, the above-named

¹ The above account is taken directly from the one great source of information, the first book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* (chap. 3). It will be found, however, substantially accordant with good modern authorities, as, for instance, that of Bishop Thirlwall (*History of Greece*, vol. ii. chap. 12). For a fuller and richer account, see Döllinger's *Heidenthum und Judenthum*.

Greek philosophers were all originally inhabitants of Asia Minor. Curiously enough, while the Grecian colonies eastward of the mother country were educating a philosophy out of their various theories of cosmogony, another set of colonies, on the south-west, had been no less active in the like pursuits, and discussion of similar problems. Pythagoras, though born in Samos (most probably about A.D. 539, just a century after Thales), established an association at once religious, philosophical, and (at least indirectly, if not directly) political, in the Greek cities of Lower Italy. The association was destroyed during the lifetime of its founder, but the members of the sect were re-admitted into Italy, and a few found their way into Greece proper. We are not here, however, concerned with the career of this remarkable man, who seems of late years to have risen considerably in the estimation of students of ancient history. We have only to speak of his doctrine concerning the universe and its origin. As is well known, what the *four* (so-called) *elements* were separately or collectively to the Ionian school; what *mind* was in the system of Anaxagoras and perhaps of his tutor Anaximenes, that to Pythagoras and his school was *number*. The chemical laws discovered in our own day by Dalton would have delighted the sage of Samos. But Pythagoras made number the pervading principle of earth and heaven; and the Deity was conceived of, as the primal One, the absolute Monad. Out of this Monad was deduced a divine soul of the world; and human souls, which were of the nature of light, were also reckoned as parts of the original *anima mundi*, though *they* came indirectly through the sun, and not directly from the supreme source of being, as did the gods. Further, as is well known, the Pythagoreans taught a doctrine unknown to the earlier Greeks, that of the transmigration of souls, which were supposed to pass through the bodies of animals. How far this teaching was original, how far (as is asserted by Herodotus) it was borrowed from Egypt, is a moot point in the history of philosophy. Certainly, the doctrine, as stated by the Pythagoreans, seems hardly distinguishable in essentials from the tenets concerning *metempsychôsis* prevalent in India.

A much earlier school than the Pythagorean, the Eleatic, had been headed by Xenophanes (born in A.D. 617), who, starting from Colophon in Asia Minor, dwelt for a time in Sicily, and finally settled in Velia or Elia in south Italy, about A.D. 536. He was a bold assailant of the anthropomorphism taught by Homer and Hesiod. But although at moments employing language patient of a thoroughly theistic

interpretation, Xenophanes yet seems to have identified God and the universe so thoroughly, as to have been not merely a Pantheist, but a Pantheist of the lowest and most materialising school. Parmenides, in the next generation (about A.D. 500) is a grander spirit, and has been highly eulogised by Plato. His Deity, if not actually distinct from the world, is apparently something more spiritual than that of Xenophanes. Like the Hindus, he regarded the visible creation as an illusion of sense. Empedocles, a Pythagorean ascetic and high-toned moralist, announced a doctrine similar to that of Parmenides; and also proclaimed a constant flux of all things—a tenet which Heraclitus had previously uttered in poetry, of which some fragments have been discovered by the research of modern scholarship. Whether, as the verses of Horace and of Mr. Matthew Arnold declare, Empedocles closed his career by plunging into the crater of Etna, seems doubtful.

Returning to Greece proper we come to the age of the Sophists, who, indeed, form a link between Athens and the Grecian colonies, as many of them, though born abroad, yet taught in that centre of thought for a large part of their lives. But as regards our present theme we need not dwell on them. Whether, with Mr. Grote, we regard them favourably, or with most of his predecessors among modern historians, unfavourably, they do not appear to have advanced anything very original concerning the relations between the Creator and things created. Aristophanes, indeed, classes them with Socrates as dethroning Zeus and substituting Dinus (the whirl and eddy of things) as a god in his stead. If we can trust him, which is certainly very doubtful, these jests imply the existence of an impression, that forces of nature were being substituted for the gods of the Hellenic pantheon.

In this connexion what are we to say of Aristotle? The general purport of his teaching concerning the Creator and creation has been set forth by S. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa contra Gentiles*, by Father Gratry in the first volume of *La Connaissance de Dieu*, by Dr. von Döllinger, in his *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, by Sir Alexander Grant in his excellent edition of the *Ethics*. The account furnished by Aquinas and Gratry seems to us—with all due diffidence be it said—to be rather unduly favourable. What little we can here find room to assert will, we think, agree in the main with the conclusions of Grant and Döllinger, as also with such part of the subject as has been handled by Dean Mansel in his *Metaphysics*.¹

¹ *The Ethics of Aristotle.* By Sir Alexander Grant, M.A., LL.D.,

In the first place, then, Aristotle is decidedly anti-materialistic. He would not have listened with patience to any such statement as that 'matter contains the promise and potency of life.'¹ His idea of Deity is that of an immaterial intellect, ever active, and yet ever unchanging, who contemplates himself. It certainly would not require any great violence to accommodate to the Christian idea of God the language of the eleventh book of the Stagirite's *Metaphysica*. But accommodation there would still need to be. Aristotle does not, more than any other heathen sage, rise to the idea of an Eternal Spirit creating a universe out of nothing. Nor does the Deity, in his scheme, exercise a real providence over creation, inasmuch as knowledge of the world would contaminate him with the evil that is in it. His influence on it is an unconscious influence, like that of a magnet upon iron. On the whole, if we must not charge Aristotle with a formalised Pantheism, it seems impossible to deny that he does often mention God and the universe as something very like co-ordinate powers; and that such personality as he does allow to his Supreme Being² does not involve the possession of the attributes of personal justice, personal freedom, personal relation to the good and evil in human nature, or in nature at large.

A great name, designedly omitted from the above list, shall receive due mention presently. But the question may arise—How did it come to pass that Pantheism, though taught by so many great and able thinkers among the founders of Greek philosophy, yet never acquired in Greece that dominant position which it won in India? This problem has not, we think, attracted the attention which it deserves. Set aside a few valuable hints in Professor Max Müller's *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, and we hardly know of any reference to

Principal of the University of Edinburgh, &c. Third edit. (London, Longmans, 1874). Vol. i. Essay v.

¹ Compare Sir A. Grant. 'The bold materialism of the last few years offers conclusions utterly irreconcilable with the philosophy of Aristotle'—*The Ethics of Aristotle*, vol. i. p. 387. Third edition. (London: Longmans, 1874.)

² e.g. God and the universe (ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος) are named in one breath, in a passage in the *Politics* (vii. 3, ed. Bekker) as conceivable instances of happiness arising out of intercourse between their component parts. Similarly too, in the *Ethics*, 'the obvious phenomena' out of which the universe is composed (ἐξ ὧν ὁ κόσμος συνίστηται) are assumed to be of a far diviner nature than man. But Endemus, as Grant and others maintain, may be responsible for the latter quotation. Others are given in the *British Critic* (vol. xxxi. page 348), and we believe in M. Jules Simon's *Theodice de Platon et d'Aristote*.

its existence. The suggestions which we offer on this topic are almost exclusively our own, and they are submitted, with all due deference, to those who are competent to judge.

In the first place, then, while we utterly repudiate the theories of those Positivists who, with Mr. Buckle, would represent climate and food as the great factors in the formation of man's spiritual and intellectual being, we do not for a moment wish to deny, that external nature has its appointed place in the nurture of the human mind. We must expect to find some difference between the inhabitants of those lands, where the forces of nature often display terrific violence, and sweep away, without warning, whole masses of the population, and the dwellers in regions where the outward aspects of scenery are for the most part gentle and benign. It must be difficult for the Greek or the Italian even to imagine such a catastrophe as that of the cyclone which on the night of October 31, in A.D. 1876, submerged a vast tract of continent and of islands near the mouths of the Ganges, and destroyed at least 100,000 lives.¹

It is also possible, that there may be some subtle connexion between these outward aspects of nature and that disposition to contemplate, rather than to indulge in trains of reasoning, to which the Oriental intellect appears so prone. Each temperament has its own special advantages, and is capable of rightful discipline and of sanctification. Each temperament has likewise its own special perils and temptations. The danger of the reasoning mind is to become hard and dry, and to look for something like mathematical demonstration in subject-matter where it is unattainable. The danger of the meditative temper lies in the direction of a vague and dreamy indolence; and such a temper, if unchecked, will find a congenial creed in Pantheism. It is needless to point out how such differences would be likely to operate respectively in the cases of Greece and of Hindustan.

Then, again, there must be taken into account the distinction, so often brought before us, between minds which love to handle problems in the abstract, and those which prefer to treat them historically. It is rare to find in one man an equal aptitude for both kinds of investigation. Nevertheless, an utter absence of either phase does undoubtedly, to some extent, tend to weaken the full development of the other. Thus, for instance, both admirers and non-admirers of the philosophy of Aquinas have agreed in affirming that the mind

¹ The only European event at all like it—the earthquake of Lisbon in A.D. 1752—produced a vast effect upon the mind of Europe.

of 'the Angelic Doctor' was not a mind historically trained. Well, that is so far a blemish upon the really wonderful extent of his knowledge and his power of thought. In the same way the utter incapacity of Lord Macaulay for metaphysical speculation prevented him from attaining to the highest rank, even in his own special department, that of history. Now, it is a part of the intellectual glory of Greece, that she was dowered with all these gifts. Side by side with the speculations on cosmogony and metaphysics, to which we have been referring, stand not only historic dramas—it is sufficient to name the *Capture of Miletus* of Phrynicus, and the *Persæ* of Æschylus—but likewise such marvellous and (in their respective lines) unsurpassed contributions to the annals of the world, as, to pass by less eminent examples, the writings of Herodotus and of Thucydides. Now, the historic sense, as will be seen, is thoroughly antagonistic to Pantheism.

This historic sense was probably created, or, at any rate, wonderfully intensified, by the great struggle¹ of Greece with Persia. That sense once cultured did not wither; and although in the decline of national greatness, the men of genius in Hellas turned from history and the drama and sculpture to the problems of science and philosophy, yet it ever remained a part of the intellectual wealth of the race. India, on the other hand, was not permitted to play any part in the political history of the world. No fiery contest with an external power bestowed on her that baptism of blood, which has so often been permitted in God's providence to create a nation's life. No internal struggles for political liberty, such as frequently follow on the repulse of a foreign foe, awoke that sentiment of individual independence and self-assertion, by which the hazy dreams of pantheistic systems have many a time been rudely dispelled.

Moreover, philosophy in Greece owned one teacher—and he probably the greatest of all—who, amidst many defects, and many inconsistencies, both moral and intellectual, must, on the whole, we conceive, be considered in his highest moments to come nearer to the teaching of revelation concerning God and the universe than any other heathen sage. On this theme, it seems only fair to lay most stress on that remarkable dialogue, the *Timæus*, which is expressly concerned with its discussion. And if, in the *Phædrus*, there is an apparent recognition of that doctrine of transmigration, which has so often been allied with pantheistic systems—if here and

¹ This is well put by Professor Max Müller (*Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 30, 31.)

there expressions may be found which look in the direction of an *anima mundi*, and forbid us to think that even Plato ever thoroughly realised the sublime conception of the formation of the world out of nothing; yet, undoubtedly, he does soar above, not only the semi-materialism of so many teachers in Asia Minor, but even the spiritual Pantheism of an Anaxagoras, and does describe the world as being, in truth, the production of a rational, and wise, and benevolent architect.¹

Now we are by no means blind to the defects in the writings and philosophy of Plato. Even in that noble Dialogue, the *Timæus*, to which we appeal for the favourable side of his cosmogony, there seems to be a denial of man's free agency; and moreover the philosopher's ideal *Republic* is sadly stained by the countenance given to a hideous form of vice. Professor M. Williams, supported by an able critic in the *Athenæum*, and by Father Goreh, claims respectively for Hindu poetry and for the Hindu sacred books, a more pure and elevated position than that attained by Grecian bards and sages.

They may be right. But it remains a fact in favour of Greece, that on so vital a point as the relation of the Creator to created things she nurtured sons, who kept alive the truth. More than 400 years after the publication of the *Timæus*, an orator on Mars' Hill was able to appeal to the noble hymn of Cleanthus, which repeats, and perhaps even transcends the teaching of Plato, in support of those great doctrines of natural religion on which Christian faith was to be built up.²

¹ This is, we think, the impression left upon all students of the *Timæus*, e.g. Mr. Davis, the translator in Bohn's version, Mr. Rowland Williams and others. It must suffice here to cite a few broken sentences, e.g. 'To discover then the Creator and Father of this universe (τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός) is difficult, and that he who has discovered Him should announce Him to all men, is impossible'—p. 29. 'Let us declare now for what cause He who framed it wrought creation and this universe' (δὲ ἦν τινα αἰτίαν γένεσθαι καὶ τὸ πᾶν τὸδε ὁ ξυνεστὰς ξυνέστησεν)—p. 30. 'But when the Creative Father (ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ) perceived that this created image of the eternal gods was endued with motion and life (κινηθὲν αὐτὸ καὶ ζῶν ἐνενόησε), he was delighted, and from his joy sought to render it still more like to its pattern'—p. 37. Mr. Rowland Williams appeals especially to a passage in pp. 47, 48, on the gift of sight and the other senses as imparted by God to man.

² Since writing the above, we find that Father Gratry, though perhaps more favourable to Aristotle than the present writer, lends support to the above remarks. The following passage occurs in his *Logique* (tome i. 378, cinquième édit. Paris: Douziol):—'De là le nihilisme et le panthéisme; le nihilisme qui, depuis trois mille ans, forme la philosophie principale d'un tiers du genre humain, la Chine; le panthéisme qui, depuis trois mille ans, forme la principale religion du monde Indien. Les Grecs ont connu tout cela, et au milieu de leur polythéisme et de leur fétichisme populaire, ils ont eu des philosophies

3. Of Rome we must speak very briefly. The famous poem of Lucretius, though in many points, as Professor Williams shows, resembling at least one of the Hindu schools of philosophy, must be set on one side as essentially atheistic. What excuses there may have been for Lucretius, and how his philanthropy and sense of the infinite have endowed his melodious strains (despite the rampant and vicious grossness displayed in portions of the poem) with an attraction and a charm for even religious minds, we must not pause to discuss. But it is to our purpose to observe, that Virgil has, as is well known, set forth, in at least two passages of great beauty, the primary tenets of Pantheism; and (like Plato and the Hindus) has combined with them the ideas of a penance to be worked out entirely through transmigration. We can only remind our readers of the earlier and less elaborate one. Its general sense is fairly retained in the vigorous, if somewhat paraphrastic version of Dryden. The poet is speaking of the wonderful sagacity displayed by the bees; and the consequent inference, which had been drawn by some, that a share of the divine intelligence—*partem divinæ mentis*—had been assigned to these small creatures. He then proceeds:—

‘For God the whole created mass inspires;
Through heaven and earth and ocean’s depths He throws
His influence round, and kindles as He goes.
Hence flocks and herds, and men and beasts and fowls,
With breath are quickened and attract their souls;
Hence take the forms His prescience did ordain,
And into Him at length resolve again.
No room is left for death, they mount the sky,
And to their own congenial planets fly.’¹

The Stoics in Rome come before us rather as moralists,

nihilistes et panthéistes. Cependant il faut reconnaître que la saine raison n’a jamais perdu tous ses droits dans le monde, même en dehors du peuple de Dieu. Il y a eu des déistes en Chine, aux Indes, surtout en Grèce. En Grèce, Socrate, Platon et Aristote ont été réellement déistes, et c’est la grande gloire de la Grèce (quelle que soit la cause de cette gloire) que sa philosophie principale n’ait été ni panthéiste ni nihiliste, et que Platon et Aristote aient réellement écrasé ces deux sectes, ainsi que nous! avons montré. L’histoire vérifie ainsi la doctrine Catholique; savoir, que l’étincelle de saine raison subsiste dans l’homme déchu.’

¹ *Georg.* iv. 219 et seq. We agree with Conington that Virgil does not here commit himself to this teaching. Keble seems to hold otherwise (*Praelect. Academ.* vol. ii. p. 783). The passage in the *Æneid* (vi. 724) does, however, look more like acceptance of it, and of the Pythagorean and Stoic tenets in general. It contains the famous words, ‘totamque infusa per artus Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.’

and as the fashioners of the grand fabric of Roman law, than as theologians. Yet it is evident that such men as Seneca, Epictetus, and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius ('with whom stoicism expired on a throne') had a theology, and that that theology—though its professors, with a happy inconsistency, appear at times to believe in a personal Father exercising a divine providence over man and all creation—is in all its leading features pantheistic.

III. We have proposed to speak in this third section of some of the palliations for Pantheism as professed in heathendom, but at the same time to deal freely with its perils.

Both Pantheism and Polytheism frequently look like two different forms of nature-worship.² But Pantheism, in its more spiritual forms, as taught by Hindu sages, by an Anaximenes or Anaxagoras, must necessarily have seemed to offer to many refined and exalted minds a refuge from the grossness of the popular Polytheism. It might be, and indeed it was, even at its very best, a melancholy aberration from that nobler and all-comprehensive truth, which we believe to have been once professed alike in India and in Hellas, and which conscience and contemplation of nature ought to have kept alive within men's hearts. But it did at least refrain from setting forth as objects of worship beings degraded by unhallowed passions, to whose acts their votaries could appeal to justify their own iniquities. And, further, it did bear witness, though in an imperfect and mistaken way, to two great, solemn, and beneficent religious truths. Of these the first is, that in Him Who made us 'we live and move and have our being;' and the second, that in union with the Creator must ever lie the highest happiness of the creature. 'For Thou,' says S. Augustine, in memorable words, 'hast made us for Thyself, and our heart is restless until it rest in Thee. *Fecisti enim nos ad Te, et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in Te.*'³

But, nevertheless, Pantheism does remain a grievous and

¹ De Broglie.

² On this point Zeller is, at present, the great authority. Where he must be read with caution is well shown by Mr. Allies, (who, however, follows him in the main,) in the very valuable book named at the head of this article. We have learnt much from Mr. Allies; and our concluding remarks will owe something to his hints. But for his preface it would not be easy, we think, to find out from this volume that he is a Roman Catholic; save that he uses the phrase 'the work of Peter' on occasions where 'the work of the Apostles' would seem to us the more natural phrase. Will the Anglo-Roman training in England ever produce such men as Dr. Newman, Mr. Allies and others, who were brought up in a free system? We greatly doubt it.

³ *S. Augustini Confess.* lib. i. cap. i.

most dangerous form of error, intellectually, morally, and religiously. Let us try to look at it in each of these aspects, though they run so much into each other, that it may not be easy to draw any very exact lines of demarcation between them.

We have unreservedly admitted already, and must here repeat the admission, that the idea of real creation, that is to say, of the production of something out of nothing, as the *fiat* of an intelligent Creator, is and ever must be a mystery. The difficulties surrounding it have been freely granted by defenders of Revelation (as, for example, by Bishop Butler and Bishop Watson in the last century, and recently by the Duc de Broglie), who have urged against mere Theists the inconsistency of rejecting Scripture, because it presents difficulties of its own, and of assuming that Theism has none. But the solution offered by the Pantheist introduces a mere confusion of thought. If there be one truth written more fixedly than another on the human intellect and conscience, it surely is the conviction of a present personality, which will endure, and which could only be extinguished by annihilation. 'I am I' and 'I shall remain I,' are positions, which the mass of mankind can never be brought to surrender. And from the conviction of our own personality we rise to at least some faint idea of a personal Creator. Nay, as a friend points out to us, the Apostle seems to acknowledge a kind of analogy between the knowledge of man taught by himself to himself, and the knowledge which the Creator has of Himself. 'For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.'¹

Hence it has come to pass, that Pantheism has never been more than the religion of the select few. In heathen lands the gods of the many have been personal, but degraded by earthly passion; the God of philosophy has been one, but he has remained a lifeless abstraction. And such an abstraction utterly fails to supply the needs of the human heart.

Further, this dreamy theology, wherever it has become really predominant as the teaching of the wisest, has by its fatalistic and crushing tendency entirely ruined the historic sense. India is, as has been already observed, the classic land of Pantheism; and if there be one fact granted by all inquirers into Indian thought—by Maurice, by Max Müller, by Monier Williams, by Father Goreh—it is this, that the Hindus have no history. It must be ever thus. Of the *modern* high-priest of Pantheism, Bunsen, though a seeming

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 11.

admirer, writes that 'he had an unhistorical mind.'¹ In Christian Europe, France, from the days of Joinville and Froissart to those of Fleury and Amédée Thierry, has led the van in biography and history. Now France, whatever its faults—and they have been too often grave and serious enough—has at any rate been remarkably free, considered as a nation, from Pantheism. The absence of history in India renders all investigation obscure, for '*it is impossible*,' writes Professor M. Williams, '*to settle the date of any single work in Sanskrit*.'

We turn to the question of morals, and (on many accounts) we do so with regret. Logically carried out, Pantheism denies the fixed and eternal distinctions between right and wrong. For if every soul be a portion of the one universal Soul, then every act of man must needs be an act of the Deity. Now the Deity, Hindus will admit, cannot do wrong; hence it is argued, and justly, that the distinction between right and wrong is in its essence illusory, however necessary as a convenience for this life. With this theory must vanish all those calls to holiness on the part of the creature, by reason of the holiness of the Creator, which form so sublime and touching an element in the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures.

Now that men are often better than their systems, and the Hindu has cherished and preserved a keener sense of sin than the light-hearted Corinthian or Athenian, is true. Far be it from us to wish to deny whatever of excellence in practice, especially domestic life, has remained there; whatever desire of purification is evinced by the tremendous penance of Brahmins, or whatever excellence is enshrined in that moral teaching of Buddhism, which Bishop Claughton and others regard as only second to that of Christianity.

But in India, Brahmanism has proved triumphant, and it is to Brahmanism that we must chiefly confine our attention. We have seen that its teaching includes the theory of a succession of temporary incarnations. How far this may have arisen, as it probably in great part has, from some ancient and perverted tradition; how far from the sense of man's need of something closer to the heart than that vague abstraction, which Pantheism offers, we need not discuss. But it is remarkable that, while Hindu doctrine represents the central Soul of the universe as untainted by evil, the ideas of perfect purity and holiness are not necessarily attached to those incarnations of the Supreme Being which have appeared on earth. Part of their superiority is supposed to lie in this

¹ Bunsen's *Hippolytus*, vol. ii. pp. 96-7.

very condition, that they are not subject to the moral law ; and that what would be sinful in man is not sinful in an incarnate God. Nay, more singular still, we find in the Vedas that a god may be appealed to in prayer by a reference to one of his acts of sin. As Father Goreh has pointed out, 'there is a ceremony mentioned in the Shadvinsa Bráhmaṇa of the Sáma Veda, in which the god Indra is to be invoked by the title, "O adulterous lover of Ahallyá!" as by an endearing appellation.' What moralist, Christian or other, can question the justice of the reverend lecturer's comment?—

'That the Veda should prescribe a ceremony in which a god, who is believed to be an adulterer, is to be worshipped, is itself very wrong. But what is still more lamentable is the fact, that his adultery, instead of being reprehended, is considered a matter of glory and praise.'

It is true, that men are told not to imitate the conduct of this incarnate god. But how great a contrast have we here to that true Incarnate Lord, who came to be not only a sacrifice, but also an example of godly life: who has not only revealed the Father and made an atonement for sin, but has also shown Himself as a pattern of the way, in which the creature should behave to the Creator.

And the results have not been less sad. Pantheism, as well as Polytheism, is a negation of the one true and living God, and we must judge of each system, not from lands wherein it has been held in check by other elements of thought, but from those in which it has ruled as the chief and dominant faith. What Polytheism became naturally in Greece and Rome we know from the language of S. Paul ; and those who refuse to accept the testimony of the Apostle must be referred to the evidence of Ovid and Suetonius, of Gibbon and M. Ernest Renan. And what is to be said in this respect of Hindustan? Sir Charles Trevelyan¹ speaks generally, and declares that it is almost necessary to have lived in heathen lands to appreciate what Christianity has done for mankind. His experience has, we believe, lain especially in India. With him we may join his celebrated brother-in law, Lord Macaulay.

The testimony of Macaulay has been recently cited in this Review, but it is too important to be passed by, and we must take the liberty of quoting it again. It is as follows:—

¹ *Recess Studies.* We quote from memory, not having the volume at hand.

'It is not necessary that a man should be a Christian to wish for the propagation of Christianity in India. It is sufficient that he should be an European, not much below the ordinary European level of good sense and humanity. *In no part of the world is heathenism more cruel, more licentious, more fruitful of absurd rites and pernicious laws.* The conversion of the whole country to the worst form that Christianity ever wore in the darkest ages would be a most happy event.'

The fact is, that Pantheism, being, as we have remarked, far too abstract a system for the many, almost of necessity involves the accompaniment of a system of polytheistic idolatry. And in India, as in other Pagan lands (as, for instance, Babylonia and ancient Italy), the very rites of religion itself became tainted and corrupt. In speaking thus, we do not wish to forget those palliations for these depraved forms of worship, which have been urged by sceptics such as Voltaire and Buckle, and to some extent admitted by such writers as Constant, Milman, and Thirlwall. But even if, with Dean Milman, we accept the *dicta* of Constant on this theme, those *dicta* must be taken as a whole. It may possibly be true that, in certain stages of society, '*des rites indécens peuvent être pratiqués par un peuple religieux avec une grande pureté de cœur.*' But that day has long since, we fear, gone by in India; and, as Constant himself proceeds to grant, '*quand l'incrédulité atteint ces peuples, ces rites sont pour eux la cause et le prétexte de la plus révoltante corruption.*' And with saying this much we would fain be content. But some of our guides do preserve on this phase of the question a reticence so extraordinary, and so likely to mislead, that we feel compelled, for honesty's sake, to employ some plainness of speech.¹ Once more, then, let us cite a passage from an oration of Macaulay, which he addressed to the House of Commons on the subject of *The Gates of Somnauth*:—

¹ Professor Monier Williams describes the Tantra books (p. 503) 'as not necessarily impure,' but as containing a teaching 'which soon degenerated into corrupt and superstitious practices;' 'doctrines which have in some cases lapsed into a degrading system of impurity and licentiousness.' He had previously (p. 422) 'commented upon the disregard of all delicacy in laying bare the most revolting particulars of certain ancient legends, which we now and then encounter in the Indian epics as a serious blot, and one which never disfigures the pages of Homer notwithstanding his occasional freedom of expression.' Notwithstanding these admissions, we feel compelled to express a respectful doubt, whether the Professor, despite his earnest desire to be fair, has succeeded in giving his readers anything like a correct idea of the real condition of matters in this respect. If we are right, he has not wholly fulfilled the promise contained in his title-page, which leads us to expect 'some account of the past and present condition of India, moral and intellectual.'

'The great majority of the population of India consists of idolaters, blindly attached to doctrines and rites which, considered merely with reference to the temporal interests of mankind, are in the highest degree pernicious. *In no part of the world has a religion ever existed more unfavourable to the moral and intellectual health of our race.* The Brahminical mythology is so absurd, that it necessarily debases every mind which receives it as truth; and with this absurd mythology is bound up an absurd system of physics, an absurd geography, an absurd astronomy. Nor is this form of Paganism more favourable to art than to science. Through the whole Hindoo pantheon you will look in vain for anything resembling those beautiful and majestic forms, which stood in the shrines of ancient Greece. All is hideous and grotesque and ignoble. As this superstition is of all superstitions the most irrational, and of all superstitions the most inelegant, *so is it of all superstitions the most immoral. Emblems of vice are objects of public worship. Acts of vice are acts of public worship.* The courtisans are as much a part of the establishment of the temple, as much ministers of the god as the priests. Crimes against life, crimes against property, are not only permitted *but enjoined by this odious theology. But for our interference human victims would still be offered to the Ganges, and the widow would still be laid on the pile with the corpse of her husband, and burned alive by her own children.* It is by the command and under the especial protection of one of the most powerful goddesses, that the Thugs join themselves to the unsuspecting traveller, make friends with him, slip the noose round his neck, plunge their knives in his eyes, hide him in the earth, and divide his money and baggage.'¹

A Mr. Ward, a Baptist missionary, has used stronger language still. His book is now more than half a century old; and it has never, so far as we can learn, been contradicted. Often in his volume he was compelled to stop short, as it was impossible to pollute his pages with such filthiness as he had seen in Hindu books and heard from Hindu priests. It is even said, that the ordinary breaches of God's commandments sink into the shade, when compared with the dreadful forms of impurity practised in Hindustan.²

Real spirituality must find it hard to flourish on such a

¹ *Speeches of the Right Honourable T. B. Macaulay, M.P.* (London: Longmans, 1854), pp. 274-5.

² See the review of Mr. Rowland Williams' Essay in the *Christian Remembrancer* for January 1858 (vol. xxxv. pp. 81 *et seq.*); and also a very important letter by Father Goreh in *Mission Life* for February 1868 (London: Macintosh). Compare also the volumes of *Mission Life* for 1870 (pp. 639, 643), for 1873 (pp. 167, 634), for 1874 (pp. 396, 433), for 1875 (p. 537). Mr. Goreh has written in the Hindi language *A Rational Refutation of the Hindu Philosophical Systems*, which has been translated into English by a Government Inspector, F. Hall, Esq., D.C.L. Oxon. (Calcutta: Bishop's College Press, 1862.)

soil. Hegel may declare that Hindustan 'has ever been the land of aspiration, and appears to us as a realm of wonder, an enchanted land,'¹ but its aspiration has been misdirected, and the process of winning it back to the true object of worship must, we fear, be long and difficult. The present posture of affairs is considered by Father Goreh to stand somewhat thus. Numbers of Hindus have adopted Theism. They have really, though half-unconsciously, been led to Theism by Christianity. But they ignore this fact, and maintain that they have learnt it from their own sacred books. They exhibit a great reluctance to welcome a religion, which has come before them as the religion of the conquering race of Englishmen; though, with some inconsistency, they are content to accept the teachings of British literature, and still more of British science. Mr. Goreh, believing that the sight of ascetics as teachers of Christianity is the only thing likely to influence his countrymen on a large scale, has, as our readers probably know, joined the society of Cowley Brothers, of which Father Benson is the Principal. Other theological aspects of Pantheism will be noticed before we close.

IV. We must now make some brief allusions to Pantheism in its attitude towards the Church of Christ.

In a rough and general way the case may perhaps be stated thus:—Pantheism has ever and anon, through the eighteen centuries of Christianity, proved itself a grave, a subtle, and a serious enemy to the religion of the Cross. Sometimes it has appeared in the gross form of a materialising religion, which has depicted the Creator as an earthly and carnal being; sometimes in a far more spiritual phase, needing but a slight disentanglement to become Christian; sometimes in a dualistic shape, proclaiming with Manichæism the existence of two rival principles, a good and evil one, engaged, amidst internecine warfare, in the production and governance of created things; sometimes trading, so to speak, upon a reaction from prosaic systems of logic, and upon incautious language employed by devout Christians concerning the nature of the union betwixt God and His creatures; and, lastly, presenting itself robed as an angel of light in a system clear-cut, logical (provided its premisses be granted), calm, comprehensive, but withal utterly ruinous, if really accepted and carried out into practice, alike to Christian faith

¹ 'Es ist immer das Land der Sehnsucht gewesen, und erscheint uns noch als ein Wunderreich, als eine verzauberte Welt'—*Philosophie der Geschichte*, cited by Mrs. Speir, as the motto to her beautiful little book, *Life in Ancient India*. London: Smith and Elder, 1856.

and Christian morals. We proceed to illustrate the items of this summary.

Although we may not be prepared, with Hammond, to see references to Gnosticism in every other page of the New Testament, yet no student of early Christian literature, or of the best ecclesiastical histories based upon it, can fail to be aware that it was the earliest intellectual foe of the faith, and that it necessitated so much of philosophic warfare, as to transform bishops into doctors and believers into *savants*. Now Gnosticism evidently embodied in its teaching a large infusion of Pantheism.¹

S. Irenæus, the great champion on behalf of God's Church against the Gnostics, became Bishop of Lyons in A.D. 177, and probably lived until nearly A.D. 200. We pass on for a century and a half. The year of grace 354 witnessed the birth of one, who, with a long list of the faithful in all ages, could utter, in accents of literal and emphatic truth, the language of the Psalmist, 'I am Thy servant *and the son of Thine handmaid*.' But before the prayers of S. Monica received a visible reply, that erratic spirit had to pass through two forms of Pantheism, the coarser one of the Manichees, the more spiritual one of the Neo-Platonists. The admissions of S. Augustine on the first point are full enough. The Divine Nature, he tells us, appeared to him in his ignorance not only a substance, but even a bodily one (*non solum substantia, sed etiam corporea videbatur*), inasmuch as he had not then learnt to recognise *mind* as anything else but a subtle body, diffused, however, through the realms of space (*quia et mentem cogitare non noveram, nisi eam subtile corpus esse, quod tamen per loci spatia diffunderetur*). He imagined that in this way he would escape the difficulty connected with the divine permission of evil; and he combined with his theory certain *emanationist* views (if the word be permissible) concerning the mystery of the Holy Incarnation. Devout Christians will, he is well aware, smile pleasantly and lovingly at him, if they chance to look at the pages of his narrative. Such, however, was then his mental state. (*Nunc spirituales Tui blandè et amanter ridebunt me, si has confessiones meas legerint; sed tamen talis eram*.)²

That S. Augustine's acceptance of Neo-Platonism was a step upward seems to be his own conviction; and, we believe, a

¹ See Burton, Neander, Hunt, Dean Mansel's posthumous volume, and the Appendix by Dr. Pusey to the Oxford translation of S. Augustine's *Confessions*.

² *Confessiones*, lib. v. cap. 10.

just one. But even in the hands of its best and most high-minded teacher, Plotinus, Neo-Platonism, though a far more spiritual form of Pantheism than Manichæism, yet still was Pantheism. It may have, as Mr. Downes maintains, considered that the Deity was not exhausted in the act of creation; but still though it refrained from saying that 'God was all things,' it did teach that 'all things were God,' and that the creature was of one substance with the Creator. It spoke also of union with God, but that union was, as M. de Pressensé justly remarks, represented as *absorption*—'an exact transcript of Brahminical asceticism.'¹ Of Augustine's comparative respect for Neo-Platonism, and still worse, perhaps, for the earlier and truer Platonism of the philosopher himself, abundant evidence can be produced from his *De Civitate Dei* and other works. His subsequent zeal against Manichæism is proved by the fact that nearly half of the eighth volume of his works in the famous Benedictine edition is occupied with treatises against them. We must dismiss them with a single remark, suggested by the eminently powerful volume of Lectures lately issued by Professor Mozley.² It is this: that the chief opponent of S. Augustine in this matter, the Manichæan Faustus, was eminently true to the spirit of Pantheism, in that he displayed a thorough hatred of history. For Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, regarded as spiritual ancestors of Christendom, Faustus proposed to substitute an hypothetical list of Magi; an imaginary catalogue of saints far more approximate to the Hindu type (and consequently to *his own* type) than the Patriarchs, whom he would fain have blotted out of the inspired records!

About A.D. 660 arose in Armenia and Cappadocia a set of Pantheists, who became known as Paulicians. They were Manichæans; and while claiming to be Christians, they dared, in the language of Gibbon, 'to violate the unity of God, the first article of natural and revealed religion.'³ It is a marvellous instance of the way, in which God's providence overrules evil to good, that Paulicianism was utterly rooted out by the spread of a religion, which, with all its imperfections, proclaimed with earnest fervour that great primary truth

¹ Art. 'Augustinus,' in Smith and Wace's new *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (London: Murray, 1877). Our limits forbid us to go into the question how the Judaic school of Philo is responsible for Neo-Platonism. On this point, Mangey, Gfrörer, Jowett, Döllinger, and Hunt may be consulted.

² *Lectures on the Old Testament.* (Rivingtons, 1877.)

³ *Decline and Fall*, chap. liv.

which Manichæism had denied. The sword of Mohammed utterly annihilated the Paulicians. And though in after years there arose in Persia those dreamy pantheising sects, the Sufis, who profess to be true disciples of Islam, their claim to the position of orthodox Moslem has ever been denied by the disciples of the Sonnites, who really preserve the teaching of the Koran. One of the greatest Moslem theologians, Gasali, has declared that 'to slay one of those mystics, who claim to be transformed into God, and to become one substance with Him, is a greater merit in the sight of Heaven than to give life to ten men.'¹ We have no desire to defend Mohammedan intolerance, but it is only just to bear in mind, that it has not always been cherished and exercised with exclusive reference to the votaries of the Cross.

We now pass onward some 200 years and step into the earlier middle age. Not long before A.D. 900, Joannes Scotus, generally known as the Erin-born (*Erigena*)—whatever that may mean—first saw the light in Wales, or in Scotland, or (as the majority say) in Ireland. He became intimate with Charles the Bald of France, and a mediæval chronicler explains elaborately, lest his readers should miss its point, the exact drift of a jest perpetrated by the learned schoolman in answer to the King, by way of showing the easiness of their relations with each other.² The peculiar character of the Pantheism taught by Scotus Erigena may be seen in the great work of Dörner on *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. One of our earliest and best investigators into the characteristics of Hindu thought, Colebrooke, declares that the similarity of Erigena's teaching and that of the Sankhya philosophy is so close as to lend probability to the tradition, that the Western monk had once travelled in the East. The orthodoxy of Erigena's other books, and of his character in general, did not ultimately save his treatise *De Divisione Naturæ* from condemnation. The interesting little treatise just put forth by Mr. Luard, the Registrar of the University of Cambridge, contains a rescript from Pope Honorius III.,

¹ Pococke, *Specimen Historiæ Arabum*. Cited by Von Döllinger in his valuable treatise on Mohammedanism—*Muhammed's Religion nach ihrer innern Entwicklung und ihrem Einflusse auf das Leben der Völker*. (Ratisbon, 1838.)

² The philosopher, being seated opposite to his Majesty at dinner, committed some breach of etiquette. Whereupon the King asked, 'What is the distance between a Scot and a sot?' and received the tolerably cool reply, 'Only the table.' The chronicler bids his readers mark that the King spoke *de intervallo morum*, but that Scotus pretended to understand it *de intervallo loci*.

bearing date January 23, A.D. 1225, that 'the treatise of John Scotus Erigena, styled *Perifisis* (i.e. *περὶ φύσεως μερίσματος*), the Dialogue *De Divisione Nature*, is to be burnt, wherever it or any part of it can be found.'

Such severity was probably intensified by the rise of the Albigenses. At this time of day we should regard it as a waste of toil to undertake the proof of the position, that the Albigenses were Manichæans. Sincere as was the piety of Milner and of Gilly, the learning of Hallam, of Palgrave, of Maitland must entirely outweigh the prejudiced statements of these *ultra*-Protestant narrators, who too often assumed, as a safe principle of investigation, what seemed to them an axiom: certain communities were persecuted by the Church of Rome; therefore such communities must of necessity have been orthodox Christians.

One more remark, and we must leave the middle ages. The concluding pages of this paper must inevitably draw attention to the great licence of thought, which has pervaded Europe since the epoch of the Reformation. But let not any one for a moment imagine that this trial is peculiar to post-Reformation times. To say nothing of the prevalence of Gnosticism, Donatism, Arianism, and Pelagianism, with semi-Arianism and semi-Pelagianism, during the first six centuries, the succeeding ages of the Church, despite occasional lulls of activity, were rife with the most varied forms of misbelief and unbelief, with the most serious and subtle dangers for Christian souls. No one has admitted this more frankly than Dr. Newman in some of his Roman Catholic publications, as, for example, in the little volumes entitled respectively *The Office and Work of Universities* and *Lectures on University Subjects*. The footnote supplies a word of evidence on this topic.¹

¹ 'The mediæval schools were the arena of as critical a struggle between truth and error as Christianity has ever endured; and the philosophy which bears their name carried its supremacy by means of a succession of victories in the cause of the Church. Scarcely had universities risen into popularity, when they were found to be infected with the most subtle and fatal forms of unbelief; and the heresies of the East germinated in the West of Europe and in Catholic lecture-rooms with a mysterious vigour upon which history throws no light. The questions agitated were as deep as any in theology; the being and essence of the Almighty were the main subjects of the disputation, and Aristotle was introduced to the ecclesiastical youth as a teacher of Pantheism. . . . It is said that in the community at large men had a vague suspicion and mistrust of each other's belief in Revelation. A secret society was discovered in the Universities of Lombardy, Tuscany, and France, organised for the propagation of infidel opinions; it was bound together by oaths,

At length the Reformation came, and not before it was needed. Matters could not have gone on as they were. Humanly speaking, but for some such shock, Christianity must needs have perished. But to expect that, in such a revolution, the men of thought and the men of action should all stop precisely at the right point, would of course be simple absurdity, while human nature remains what it is. We have only to deal with the memory of a few persons, who stand prominent in connexion with our present theme.

The name of Bruno was thrice in the eleventh century set forth as a type of mediæval sanctity. There is S. Bruno of Rodez, who was martyred by pagans in A.D. 1008; S. Bruno of Wurtzburg, who died in A.D. 1045; and a third, far more celebrated than either of these, the S. Bruno, who (about A.D. 1086) became the founder of the Order of the Carthusians. But five hundred years later there flourished the first modern professor of Pantheism, who perished at the stake, the unfortunate Giordano Bruno, who was burnt at Rome, on February 17, A.D. 1600. We cannot pause to dwell upon the question of intolerance. The crime of the Roman Court in putting Bruno to death was not greater than that of Calvin, when (with the approbation of Melancthon and all the Continental reformers) he brought the career of Servetus to the same terrible termination; not greater than that of the Eng-

and sent its missionaries among the people in the disguise of pedlars and vagrants.

'The success of such efforts was attested in the south of France by the great extension of the Albigenses, and the prevalence of Manichæan doctrine. The University of Paris was obliged to limit the number of its doctors in theology to as few as eight, from misgivings about the orthodoxy of its divines generally. The narrative of Simon of Tournay, struck dead for crying out after lecture, "Ah, good Jesus, I could disprove Thee, did I please, as easily as I have proved," whatever be its authenticity, at least may be taken as a representation of the frightful peril to which Christianity was exposed. Amaury of Chartres was the author of a school of Pantheism, and has given his name to a sect; Abelard, Roscelin, Gilbert, and David de Dinant, Tanquelin, and Eon, and others who might be named, show the extraordinary influence of anti-Catholic doctrines on high and low'—(*Lectures on University Subjects*, pp. 299-301.)

In accordance with the practice of the time—a practice which Roman Catholic writers are seldom found to condemn without being censured—ten of the disciples of Amaury (or, as he was called in Latin, *Amalricus*) were burnt just outside Paris, on December 20, A.D. 1210. Amaury was then dead, but his body was exhumed and burnt with his books, and with them the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle. No pity was felt for these misguided men, and a chill in the atmosphere (*airis inclementia*) was universally attributed to their malign influence.—(*Nouvelle Biog. Générale*: Art. 'Amaury').

lish Government, when it crushed to death the pure and high-minded Margaret Clitherow for harbouring a Roman Catholic priest. But it seems possible that M. de Montalembert, in his eloquent denunciation of all such deeds, may have been thinking, though of course by no means exclusively, of Giordano Bruno. At this moment youthful students in Italy are engaged in appealing to Europe for funds to erect a monument to his memory; less, we imagine, from any deep sympathy with Pantheism, than as a protest on behalf of science—for, like Servetus, Bruno was a scientific man—and as a kind of mark of the reaction against the punishment of heresy with death. In like manner, Mr. Bradlaugh, who has for many years past made a special hero of Giordano Bruno, and who has been wont—may the blasphemy be forgiven him!—to draw a contrast between Bruno and the highest Pattern of all human excellence, has no apparent sympathy with the theology of the Neapolitan teacher (for the English lecturer boldly avows either Agnosticism or else sheer Atheism), but cherishes and honours his memory as that of a sort of anti-Christian martyr. There are those, however, who maintain that Bruno was put to death, less for his theological tenets than for his zeal in proclaiming the doctrine of the plurality of worlds and the Copernican system of astronomy. Strangely enough, moreover, this Italian teacher, despite his love for science, firmly believed in magic and astronomy.¹ On looking back at his career and the sentiments evoked by its dreadful close, a Talleyrand would probably apply to the act of the Papal *Curia* Fouché's cynical comment on Napoleon's execution of the Duc d'Enghien, that 'it was worse than a crime—it was a mistake.' Other men of science of this day, as for instance Mr. Browning's hero, Paracelsus, appear also to have lapsed into Pantheism.

Just thirty-two years after the death of Bruno, was born at Amsterdam the great high-priest of modern Pantheism, the Jew, Baruch Espinoza, better known as Benedict Spinoza.² Wherein has lain the secret of his strength, and why do so many thinkers of our day require us to honour his memory?

¹ See the article 'Bruno (Giordano)' in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Générale* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1854) and an Essay by M. Emile Saisset in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for 15 *Juin* 1847.

² *Benedictus* is the Latin equivalent of the Hebrew *Baruch*. Espinoza is probably the Spanish form of the name. As our readers are probably aware, a Spaniard who attempts to speak English can seldom pronounce *Spain*, *stop*, *state*, *squire*, but always says *Espain*, *estop*, *estate*, *esquire*. Modern Italian writers, as Azeglio, have taken to putting *istesso* for *stesso* and the like.

The grounds of his deep and wide-spread influence, and the reasons why such deep honour is demanded for his memory, may perhaps be stated thus. He became strong, because he took up all that India and Greece had provided, and cut away all extraneous matter from the cycle of *his* system of Pantheism. No Polytheism side by side with it, no material idolatry, no theory of transmigration, no belief in any real incarnation, mar the completeness of Spinoza's teaching. That teaching is not indeed, after all, a consistent whole; but when placed in juxta-position with earlier schemes of Pantheism, it looks comparatively such.

Moreover, the European mind seems to have become in some measure prepared for the teaching of Spinoza, partly by the philosophy of Descartes, partly by a spirit of reaction from a too bare and matter-of-fact presentation of the progress of discovery in the realms of inductive science; and partly, it may be, by some lack of due caution in theorising on the part of Christian thinkers of undoubted piety, among whom stands conspicuous the acute and devout name of Malebranche. Evidence on this last-named topic has been set forth with great fulness of knowledge, acuteness of perception, and evident desire to be fair, by Professor Edward Caird, in his recent article on *Cartesianism*.¹ To go fully into this question would require a separate discussion on mystic theology. The present writer does not profess to have examined the works of Malebranche with such thoroughness, as to entitle him to speak with any confidence on the position maintained by Mr. Caird, that the philosophy of this sincerely Christian student is but a half-way house between the position occupied by Descartes and the later one adopted by Spinoza. Some suspicion is thrown upon it by the eagerness, with which a bad construction has been placed on the writings of Malebranche by Voltaire. Nevertheless, it is beyond all question, that there have been thinkers, who, with the most excellent intentions, have laid down principles, which have proved injurious to the very faith which they earnestly desired to defend. Some even imagine that Dean Mansel may unwittingly have furnished weapons for the Agnostic assaults upon the faith now made by Mr. Herbert Spencer: a question to which we must ere long advert. And in respect of our present subject, we find a pious theologian, Lessius, admitting that a charge of Pantheism had been brought by one great divine, Gerson, against another equally

¹ In the new (the ninth) edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. See list of works at the head of this article.

great, John Rusbroch. And although Lessius successfully rebuts the charge, the mere fact of its having been made shows the great need of precision in all that concerns the description of the nature of the union betwixt God and His creatures, which in some sense arises out of their creation and preservation, but is so wondrously and mercifully deepened by the Incarnation. Theologians should take heed never to lend countenance to the idea, *ut desinat nostrum esse creatum et convertatur in esse increatum*.¹

We have not room for any disquisition on the way in which an undue love of induction may cause a reaction in the direction of Pantheism. But students of logic will easily see how the intense and indeed extravagant yearning for unity cherished by Pantheists may easily come into collision with the true inductive spirit; and of course still more easily with any excessive passion for induction as the sole instrument of investigation into truth.² If we remember rightly, Hegel³ expressed intense dislike to the *Principia* of Newton; and Goethe, one of the bards of Pantheism, could not conceive that a knowledge of the Differential Calculus had any bearing upon his anti-Newtonian theory of Colours. It is also possible that the (not wholly undeserved) severity with which the pantheistic Emerson has spoken of Lord Macaulay's *Essay on Bacon* may in part, though only in part, have its origin in a similar divergence of sentiment.

It is right, however, to say one word on the manner in which the rise and progress of Socinianism may have aided the impression wrought by Spinoza. A Socinian, who

¹ *Lessius de L. Nominibus Dei*—Coloniz 1656 (p. 181). Poets are allowed much licence; and the undoubted orthodoxy of Dante, Keble, and Metastasio renders the reader certain that *they* cannot have intended to teach Pantheism, when they sing of nature moving to the sea of the Divine Will (*Paradiso* iii. 85), or of our *losing ourselves* in the ocean of God's love (*Evening Hymn*), or of the human spirit running like a river to find repose in the great sea. But we do wish that Mr. Kirkman, in his excellent book *Philosophy without Assumptions* (London: Longmans, 1876), had used more cautious language on this subject in his Preface.

² We do not forget that the great maintainer of the all but entire sufficiency of induction, the late J. S. Mill, had some leanings (inherited from his father) in the direction of Manichæism. But all rules are liable to exceptions.

³ We must not venture, *en passant*, to express any opinion on the amount of good and the amount of harm wrought by the philosophy of Hegel. A debate between an English admirer (A.) and an English assailant (B.) of this sage is said to have ended as follows: A.—'In fact the man was a perfect Plato!' B.—'Plato indeed! *Electro-Plato*!'

attempts to philosophise, not uncommonly reasons somewhat as follows: 'How is it possible that an Absolute Being should have a Threefold Personality?' But on one side and on the other side of the Socinian stand respectively a Pantheist and a Trinitarian; and both exclaim in a breath, 'My friend, how is it possible to conceive an Absolute Being possessing *any* kind of Personality at all?' It is of course one of those arguments, which may impel a thoughtful mind into one of two opposite paths. In America (especially in that home of Socinianism, Boston) its force appears to have been deeply felt, but not, we rejoice to find, in one direction only. Many Socinians of that region have, with a too natural declension, betaken themselves to Pantheism; but many also have been led to walk on an opposite road, and have become earnest and devoted Churchmen.

And now as to the reasons, for which we are called upon to pay special honour to Spinoza's memory. They will be found, we believe, to run after the following fashion. Spinoza is to be honoured, because in the domain of philosophy he was at any rate on the anti-materialist side; because he lived a pure and simple life, regardless alike of money and of fame; because he bore censure and excommunication calmly and bravely; because he was not revengeful, and did not take any steps to discover the man who tried to assassinate him. Additional honour is claimed for him, because he stood alone against the denunciation of his Jewish brethren; because his writings bore abundant fruit in philosophy (as is witnessed by the systems of Lessing, Fichte, Jacobi, Schelling, and Hegel), and abundant fruit in literature, as is shown in the poetry of a Goethe and a Shelley, and (though perhaps less distinctly) in other poetic inspirations of our age; because his system has favourably affected art and deepened our love of nature; because he has received the most marked and emphatic eulogy from professed theologians, among whom are to be found Schleiermacher, M. Renan, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Professor Jowett, and the Dean of Westminster. Let us attempt briefly to analyse the varied nature of these alleged claims upon our gratitude and admiration.

Some of them must, we consider, be frankly acknowledged to be claims which are genuine and well founded. Purity, courage, simplicity, freedom from avarice, forgiveness of injury deserve recognition everywhere; and all these virtues were exhibited by Spinoza throughout his entire life. Those who wish to exalt his credit, *as a man*, may call attention to the utterly opposite career of a recent teacher of Pantheism,

Schopenhauer,¹ whose miserable cowardice and selfishness stand in the strongest possible contrast to the excellences of Spinoza. We must own that in our judgment, as in the case of Pelagius and so many more, it is the high character of the man which has rendered his erroneous teaching so seriously dangerous.

Then again, as regards his anti-materialism, and the possibility of an increased love of nature having arisen out of his philosophy, these are no doubt good elements. Whether any large portion of that taste for noble scenery so strongly manifested in modern poetry and art, and in travels undertaken to gratify it, can be really traced to the influence of Spinoza, seems to us, we own, rather doubtful. But it is possible that our prejudices may incline us to underrate his share in this good work. There is, however, cause for satisfaction in the reflection that Burns, amidst many faults and shortcomings, never misleads his readers into a deification of external nature; that the slightly pantheistic tinge of Wordsworth's earlier verse entirely disappears from his maturer poems; that the eloquence of the prose poet, who, more than any other Englishman has sent our artists and our architects to the study of nature, Mr. Ruskin, has always been guided and chastened by a thoroughly religious and Christian temper; and that the true argument deducible from 'the divine beauty of created things' to the personality and lordship of the Creator-Spirit has lately been set before us, with all his wonted power, by one of the most acute and able of modern thinkers, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.²

But is it quite reasonable to ask us to accept and cherish and honour a given system of thought, because its author was a man of good life? Suppose that we maintain, that the philosophy which taught that all our knowledge was obtained not merely *through*, but *by* the senses, and by reflection on the truths thus gained, was logically pressed by the French Encyclopædists into a gross materialism, and thus fostered the unbelief so fatally intertwined with the great French Revolution of 1789; suppose we maintain, that in the refutation of this false psychology the system of Kant proved triumphant,

¹ We cannot often, we fear, approve of the writings of Miss Cobbe, but we do feel thoroughly grateful to her, for her scourging account of the wretched weaknesses of this advocate of pessimism in the *New Quarterly Review*.

² Canon Mozley, *University Sermons* ('Sermon on Beauty'). 'La divina bellezza delle cose create' is the expression of *Azoglio* in *Ettore Fieramosca*.

and wrought a signal service for mankind,—is it any real reply to remind us that John Locke was a man of the most stainless reputation, a manly character alike in thought and action, of whom, in many ways, his country may well be proud? Or look again in another direction. Let us imagine that some of those, who think us very unreasonable, if we refuse to subscribe to a statue to be erected to Benedict Spinoza, were in their turn invited to join in an effort to raise a memorial to Ignatius Loyola. Few, we suppose, would imitate the bigotry of Mr. Carlyle and denounce Loyola as a bad man. 'There was earnest devotion in that age,' said the late Mr. Maurice to the writer of these lines, 'and mind, I recognise it in Loyola, as well as in Luther.' 'No dispassionate student of his life,' writes Sir James Stephen, 'will question his integrity, or deny him the praise of a devotion at once sincere, habitual, and profound. It is not to the glory of the Reformed to depreciate their greatest antagonist.'¹ 'Fervent he was,' says the Nonconformist, Isaac Taylor, 'fervently devout; and our Protestant notions would lead us into a very perilous kind of uncharitableness, if they forbade our thinking of Ignatius Loyola as an eminently good and Christian man.'² Now we do not intend any offensive analogy; we cannot for our part think of placing such a man as Loyola in the same category as the most potent teacher of one of the most deadly of all heresies. All that we do urge is this. If a conviction that Jesuitism, as a whole, has wrought much evil as well as good, is cause sufficient for declining to join in any scheme for rendering honour to the founder of the system, why, *mutatis mutandis*, it is unreasonable to urge a like plea—to our thinking, *infinitely* intensified—when invited to celebrate the bicentenary of the death of Spinoza?

When we hear of the acceptance of a given doctrine by this or that man, it is surely natural to ask, Is it a rise or is it a declension in religion? For an African fetish-worshipper to become a Mohammedan is a great advance; for a Christian to turn Mohammedan is a sad and miserable fall. On the part of an Anaxagoras, perhaps even of a Plotinus and of many more, a spiritualised form of Pantheism was probably a step upward from the creed of Polytheism. But how must we regard the acceptance of such a creed when we look at it in the case of a Spinoza?

We are reminded by a just but gentle critic that at any

¹ *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*. 'The Founders of Jesuitism.' (London: Longmans, 1849.) Vol. i. p. 249 (first edit.)

² *Loyola and Jesuitism*, p. 183. (London: Longmans, 1849.)

rate Spinoza never was, never pretended to be a Christian. That is most true; and it should certainly be taken into account in estimating what seems to us the depth and sadness of his fall. For a fall it surely was, though he did not possess the many safeguards which ought to shield a Christian from such a lapse into falsehood. Still the sad and painful fact remains, that Benedict Spinoza was, alas! a member of that chosen race, to whose care had been committed the oracles of God; whose loving devotion to a living Father in heaven had been the unique characteristic which had marked off all their literature from the noblest achievements of Greece and Rome; and that he gave up the faith of his fathers, and employed the great powers, wherewith he had been endowed, to proclaim to listening Europe the existence of a lifeless abstraction as the supreme power in the universe. For 'Spinoza,' as we once heard it truly remarked by an eminent man,—'Spinoza may have believed in a God, but it was a God I should as soon think of worshipping, as I should think of falling down to adore the force of gravitation.'

And this point brings us naturally to the relation between Spinoza and the Synagogue. It is not uncommon to find Spinoza described as a harmless, quiet, brave victim of mere intolerance. Undoubtedly the struggle of one against many possesses a fascination of its own for many generous hearts; and there is a disposition to believe that all such cases may prove to be but anticipations or repetitions of the contest of an *Athanasius contra mundum*. But does history always bear witness to the correctness of this amiable prepossession? Has authority always proved in the wrong? Is it not true that the many instances of its just decisions are forgotten, simply because they are taken as a matter of course, and do not in the same way appeal to the feelings and to the imagination? And is not a little charity occasionally needed for the judges, as well as for him whom they condemn?

What was the Synagogue to do? Here was a man of great mental acuteness sapping the very foundation upon which all their claims, nay, all their very life's life and deepest convictions had rested for three thousand years. *They* believed that God had given them a revelation; Spinoza taught that revelation was an impossibility, and that the very notion of such a *message* to man would dishonour the kind of God whom he proclaimed; *they* taught that God had wrought marvels for their fathers, *he* taught that all miracles were impossible, and spoke of the career of an Elijah and Elisha in the same breath with the fables of the impure Roman poet

who sang the *Metamorphoses*; they told of One Who had displayed His love to his children, and Who had condescended to ask it in return, as the first great duty and privilege of mankind; *he* taught the existence of a soul of the universe, identical with created nature, which had no affection to give, and consequently could not inspire it in those who gazed upon its cold perfections. And though, with them, he taught an immortality of the soul; such a doctrine was in his system an excrescence and an inconsistency, while with them it was the natural correlative of their doctrine concerning God. Finally, they were deeply conscious of the existence of sin; and they glorified the object of *their* worship, especially in this, that He was a God Who forgiveth sin.¹ But in the system of Spinoza it is hard to understand how sin can be recognised as a reality, and how, if ever committed, it can be forgiven. To have allowed Spinoza to remain in their communion would have been tantamount to an admission, that his teaching was not inconsistent with the Law and with the Prophets, and the men, who could have calmly sat down and tolerated such an admission as that, must have lived and died with a lie in their right hands.

But then, say the apologists of the philosopher, look at the terrible rites, with which Spinoza was expelled by the Jews of the Portuguese synagogue at Amsterdam; listen to the fearful words of the anathema they launched against him. Now the terrible rites seem not to have been employed, as even the latest panegyrist of Spinoza admits. As regards the form of the anathema, a Christian is not called upon to defend it, and there is certainly that in it—especially its prayer that he may not be pardoned, and its interdiction of all good offices towards him—which is much to be regretted; though probably many of those, who denounce it, would equally denounce the conclusion of the original draft of the Nicene Creed, and even (we greatly fear) the language of S. Paul and of S. John.

And that body of philosophy and of literature, which has arisen out of his writings—what is to be said concerning it? Fain would we be on our guard, knowing as we do how strongly our bent lies in an opposite direction—against a merely one-sided estimate of its value. The works of great geniuses, alike in science and in letters, are ordained by God as a part of the education and the probation of his creatures. Again and again, even when they intend it not, the possessors of high gifts render Him some unconscious service; like Balaam, they bless those, whom they had arisen to curse; like Caiaphas,

¹ See especially Micah vii. 18, 19; Isaiah lvii. 15, 16.

they prophesy some vital truth beyond their ken. And some of those, whom we have named, assuredly meant well and wrought a work, which was not all unblest. The work of Lessing was far more, we imagine, for good than harm; Fichte was a sincere patriot, and lived a pure and noble life; and the systems of Jacobi and Schelling and Hegel have also, we presume, a side of merit and of excellence. But still it is quite impossible for any Christian man to ignore the darker side. Waiving, for the moment, all mention of the strongly pantheistic elements in the philosophy of Schelling and of Hegel, we cannot be wrong in asserting that there is a straight road from the works of Spinoza to the production of the *Leben Jesu* of Strauss.

Similar language, perhaps somewhat stronger, must be applied to the literature which has partially, at least, emerged from the same fountain-head. A philosophic and pious Lutheran, Julius Müller, may be right in asserting, that the genius of Goethe has at moments (as in parts of *Faust*) burst through the trammels of his Spinozism, and displayed a keener sense of what is meant by sin than is at all compatible with the philosophy of his teacher. But taking the German literature of the period, which followed on the decease of Spinoza, as a whole, it cannot be denied that Voss, Schiller, Richter, Wieland are justly said to have released themselves from the bonds of dogmatic Christianity. And Goethe's great endowments are painfully marred by the selfishness and sensuality but too prominent in many of his wonderful productions.

And here we must express our gratitude not only to such writers on Pantheism as Mr. Downes, Prebendary Row,¹ and Mr. Allies; but likewise to two other critics from whom we cannot always look for such welcome aid; namely, the author of a celebrated article on Spinoza, in the *Westminster Review* for July 1855, and Mr. Leslie Stephen.

The Reviewer has pointed out, with great force, on what a basis of pure assumptions, of unproved hypotheses, the system of Spinoza is built up; how completely the perfections which it ascribes to God are devoid of all moral character whatever, and how difficult it is to find any place in it

¹ Mr. Row's criticisms on such themes are always well worthy of study. His lecture will be found named at the beginning of this article. The translation of M. Saisset's book is thus far more valuable than the French original, in that his translator has supplied valuable corrections to his author's deficiencies. Nevertheless the argument against Spinoza appears to be extremely well handled and deserves a very grateful recognition. Victor Hugo and a few physicists seem to be exceptions to the generally non-pantheistic character of French literature.

for a straightforward admission of the reality of evil. He also surmises, that some fair and graceful elements of the *Ethica* are really, though perhaps unconsciously, borrowed from Christianity.

Mr. Leslie Stephen, in a brief notice of Spinoza contained in his new work on the *Eighteenth Century*, frankly acknowledges that Spinoza's God is not and cannot in anywise be acknowledged as the Christian's God. His language evidently justifies the abhorrence, which all true Theists, who have looked into the matter, entertain for the theories of this renegade from Judaism.

We have not space for specimens of Spinoza's propositions. Those who do not possess his works may see such samples in the Essays of Mr. Hunt and of Mr. Downes, and in the *Westminster Review*. We do not think it likely that the creed of Spinoza will be openly and dogmatically professed by any large number of persons in Great Britain or in France. As we have said, Pantheism never can win the heart of the multitude—a great truth dwelt upon with much beauty and eloquence by Lacordaire in one of his sermons, and no less forcibly in those well-known words of a German Protestant, the historian Niebuhr, in which that eminent man avows his belief in the supernatural elements of the New Testament, and declares that a Christianity 'without a personal God, without immortality, without any individuality of man, without historical faith, may be a very ingenious and subtle philosophy, but is no Christianity at all.'¹

Nevertheless, there is so much sympathy between forms of error, that the Atheist and the Agnostic will always, with a just instinct, hail the Pantheist as one of their best allies. Much of the vague, dreamy, hazy scepticism, which saps men's spiritual life and energy, and 'cuts the sinews' of belief, is traceable to the baneful influence of Pantheism, and of its prophet of Amsterdam. And in many cases Spinozism takes a form, which fully justifies the author of *Lothair* in describing Pantheism as 'Atheism in domino;' for, as he justly asks,—What is a Creator, who is unconscious of creating? And herein perhaps lies its chief peril. As Mr. Downes most truly teaches, not only do these theories bring opprobrium on philosophy, but there is a Nemesis in all erroneous speculation, as in all wrong-doing. They make personality

¹ *Life of Niebuhr*, vol. ii. The words which follow are, 'Again and again I have said that I know not what to do with a metaphysical God, and that I will have no other but the God of the Bible, Who is heart to heart.'

only phenomenal, and human liberty an illusion; they destroy the possibility of all religion and religious worship.

That M. Renan should pronounce the *éloge* on Spinoza is natural enough. Professor Jowett, if we remember rightly, only maintained the virtues of the man. But we fear that, though the Master of Balliol may be able to appreciate the idea of sanctified intellect, he can hardly be brought to allow the possibility of *unsanctified* intellect, except where the man's life is morally reprehensible. As for Dean Stanley's recent utterances at St. Andrew's, his reference to Spinoza¹ is so indeterminate that it may be made to mean almost anything. Yet the best construction that can be put upon it implies, that Calvinism is so utterly bad, that Pantheism is preferable to it. We are no Calvinists, and assuredly nothing on earth could induce us to sign the *Westminster Confession*! But it is a new thing to hear the deadly errors of Spinoza preferred to Calvinism, and stranger still when the audience was one which professes—it is a mere profession—to take the Westminster Confession as its recognised formulary of doctrine.

V. Happily the due inculcation of the fundamental dogmas of the Christian Faith, those of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, form the best and most vital protest against Pantheism. All teaching which brings before us the personal nature of Christianity is the natural antidote to this ancient error. Let it be shown how all abstractions are realised in that Incarnate Lord, Who is made unto us Wisdom and Righteousness. Let the existence of the holy Angels, and of the fallen Angels, have as marked a place in our theology as it has in Holy Scripture. Let the Being of the Creator be proclaimed as that of Him, Who is alike the efficient and the final cause of the entire universe. Let the creatureship of man be ever taught; and yet along with it that wonderfully co-creatureship which must so largely influence all our notions of morality and of fraternity: the brotherhood of Him Who said: 'I ascend to My Father, and your Father; and to My God, and your God.' And as Pantheism offers a false mysticism, let us be careful never to discourage a due proportion of the true mysticism. For the rest we will put our trust in prayer, and in the clear and simple protests of the Creeds, and, above all, of the Word of God.

¹ We cite it from a report of which the Dean has acknowledged the correctness. 'Not to the Synod of Dort, but to the aspirations of the excommunicated Spinoza, was vouchsafed the *clearest glimpse into the nature of the Deity*.' Is it possible that Dr. Stanley can have bestowed any serious study on the works of the man of whom he thus speaks?

ART. II.—JUSTIN MARTYR'S EPISTLE TO
DIOGNETUS AND THE ORATION TO
THE GENTILES.

THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament. Pp. 85-92, Part I, § 5. 'The Letter to Diognetus.' By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fourth Edition, with New Preface. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1875.)

WE propose plainly and openly to ask for the reversal of the judgment which has placed the document known among us as the Epistle to Diognetus amongst the early Christian writings. To clear ourselves from the charge of presumption, let us say at once that we do not intend to discuss, or even to pass an opinion upon the sufficiency or insufficiency of the grounds upon which that judgment has been given. We shall say almost nothing upon the points which have been heretofore debated; for our contention is not with any particular theory respecting the Epistle which may be current, still less with any particular critic. We simply ask that the question shall be re-opened and re-judged on some entirely fresh evidence, which we have to bring forward. Our evidence, and the way in which we handle it, are distinct matters. We invite criticism on the first of these; we do not shun it on the last, though we feel how much less there would be for the critic to do, if the work had fallen into other hands. We only ask of those, who must be judges on this question, on the one hand not to dismiss the evidence we shall bring forward without due examination, if it shall appear—as indeed must be the case—that we have here and there, and probably often, fallen into error; and, on the other hand, not to forget that, since the evidence to be brought forward is new, the Epistle must be examined as though now on its trial for the first time, and that the length of time that it has been before the world, and the hold¹ which it has

¹ The advice of the writer of the Epistle (c. ii. 1) to Diognetus is not unseasonable.

obtained upon the affections of many, must for the while be put out of sight.

Before we bring forward our evidence we must make such prefatory remarks as may help to make the subject generally intelligible.

The Epistle, together with the 'Oratio ad Græcos,' was first printed and published by Henri Estienne or Etienne (better known perhaps as H. Stephanus or Stephens), the celebrated printer, in 1592. With these two writings Stephens published his own elaborate annotations, adding some translations, and some criticisms of his friend Beurer, to whom he had sent the MS., and also, by way of illustration, some passages from Eusebius and Photius, and some remarks of his own upon Tatian. In 1593 Sylburg included these two writings in his edition of Justin Martyr, by whom they purported to be written. Sylburg added to his own notes and conjectures the 'various readings' of Beurer's transcript, and the conjectures both of Stephens and Beurer. So far as we can gather, the original manuscript was seen only by Stephens and Beurer, and possibly¹ by Isaac Casaubon, Stephens' son-in-law; while the knowledge of Beurer's transcript was confined to Stephens and Sylburg. The transcript made by Stephens (*Apographon Stephani*), now in the university of Leyden, together with Sylburg's account of Beurer's transcript (*Apographon Beureri*) was the authority upon which the Epistle rested until the beginning of the present century.² At that time, however, the 'Codex Argentoratensis'³ came to light in the Library of Strasburg. This Codex was found to contain both the Epistle and the Oration. The question has been much debated, whether this Strasburg manuscript was the ancient exemplar which Stephens used. We shall not discuss it. Suffice it to say that when the comparison of the Strasburg manuscript with the editions of Stephens and Sylburg was made, some curious particulars were observed, on which it was possible to argue both sides of the question with almost equal force. This Codex was unfortunately destroyed in the late Franco-German war.

¹ 'Quamobrem non displicebit fortasse Isaaci Casauboni conjectura, ἀπ' ἀλέθρου ποιμένος scribentis'—Steph. *Notes Orat. ad Græc.* p. 74.

² We are indebted to Dr. Ewing, *Libr. Strasb.* for this information.

³ This Codex contained some other treatises ascribed to Justin, and, among other writings, some pages of Sibylline Oracles, and so far bore resemblance to the meagre account given by Stephens of the MS. which he used. An inscription on the back said that the Codex, or at any rate part of it, once belonged to Johann Reuchlin.

The Epistle itself is a letter addressed to a certain Diognetus, and is a well-conceived apology for Christianity, written in a style 'simple, vigorous, and classical.' It argues against idolatry, condemns the observances of the Jews, dilates upon the simplicity of early Christian life, expounds God's purpose in sending His Son for us men, and explains why Christianity came into the world 'now,' and not at some earlier time. The intrinsic excellence of this remarkable document may be gathered from the fact that the scholar has found something to admire in its diction, that the theologian has cited it in defence of the faith, that the critic has consulted it in his examination of the Canon of the New Testament, and that very many have regarded it, and do regard it, with feelings of the deepest reverence and affection.

By whom was it written? It is not named in any catalogue of ancient writings, nor is it once alluded to by any ecclesiastical writer. From the manuscript it would appear to be by Justin Martyr, and for a long time it was so regarded. This opinion is now well nigh universally set aside. Canon Westcott in his *Canon of the New Testament* (p. 86, 4th ed. note) gives a short summary of the reasons for this reversal of judgment. He himself relies upon the difference in style. Now we must observe that if we cut the Epistle adrift from Justin Martyr, it becomes, as it were, a waif and stray amidst Christian literature, for it has no sufficient internal marks of date, at least not any that lie upon the surface. How little the supposed notes of time can be relied upon, we may gather from the fact that Galland places it in the Apostolic age; that Otto clings to the authorship of Justin; that Bunsen assigns one part of the Epistle to Marcion and the remainder to Hippolytus; that the Dresselian edition of the *Apostol. Patr.* selects a time soon after Clement of Alexandria; that Overbeck would have it that it was written after the time of Constantine; while Dr. Donaldson says that some circumstances 'led' him

'to suspect that the Epistle to Diognetus might possibly be the production of Henricus Stephanus himself. If the Strasburg Codex is as old as it is said to be, this notion would be completely refuted. And even if it were not, one should be cautious in attributing forgery to any one. I am inclined to think it more likely that some of the Greeks who came over to Italy, when threatened by the Turks, may have written the treatise, not so much for the wish to counterfeit a work of Justin's, as to write a good declamation in the old style. But there is no sound basis for any theory with regard to this remarkable production.'—*Hist. Christ. Lit. and Doc.* vol. ii. p. 142.

Since, then, those notes of time, which lie upon the surface of the Epistle, fail us, we must try another method of solving the question of the date of authorship. We must compare the Epistle with other literature, and especially Christian literature, for it is certain that an author will betray, either consciously or unconsciously, his acquaintance with those writings which are to him as household words. As the speech of Peter 'bewrayed' him, and marked him as a Galilean, so his Epistles, written long after, show that in later life he had fallen under other influences, and learned to utter words that he could neither have spoken nor written while by the Sea of Galilee. We have made this comparison, and we offer to our readers the result, as the evidence upon which the authenticity of the Epistle must be re-examined.

In an inquiry of this nature there are three points, as it seems to us, to be considered, of which the first is by far the most important.

1. What is the date of the Epistle, or rather, what is the earliest date which can be assigned to it?

2. Who was the author?

3. What objects had he in view in writing it?

1. When we examine the Epistle on the method above proposed, the following facts come to light.

(1) A vast number of coincidences in thought and language are found between our Epistle and writers of all times, from Plato and Philo downwards to John of Damascus, who died A.D. 750 (*Cave*), and perhaps still later to Photius.

If at any point in the series of writers we have mentioned we could establish a marked difference in the character of the coincidences, we should be justified in inserting the Epistle at that point, on the supposition that our writer was no longer copying others, but himself being copied. We find, however, no such point. If we put aside all pre-conceived opinions and prejudices, and simply regard the Epistle as coming now for the first time into our hands for examination, we are compelled to place it at the bottom of the list, and to conclude that it could not have been written earlier than the eighth or ninth century.

(2) These coincidences or parallels cover the Epistle from end to end, so entirely, that in several cases parallels are found for the very errors that seem to have crept into the text in the course of transcription, out of pages at which we have reason for supposing that the author of the Epistle was looking.

A third fact may now be noticed.

(3) The coincidences of which we speak extend to the marginal notes and memoranda written upon the MS. found at Strasburg.

The conclusion would seem necessarily to follow, that since the whole of the Epistle, as it stood in the Strasburg MS., together with the notes upon its margin, presents the same phenomena, it had one and the same hand for its author. The Strasburg MS. is supposed to have been of the thirteenth or fourteenth century. The inference should follow that the Epistle is of no earlier date. We do not, however, insist on this; in the first place, because we do not desire to attach an undue importance to the coincidences with these marginal notes; in the second place, because it may be argued that the entire MS. notes as well as text were copied from an earlier exemplar. We are thus thrown back upon the date just given; and we only say that, though that date may possibly, and even probably, be much later, it cannot, if the evidence from the parallels taken from ancient authors is to be believed, be put earlier than the eighth or ninth century. Other considerations may force us to take a still later date; but on that point we do not now enter.

2. We do not propose to discuss the question of authorship at this time. The question is a delicate one, and we prefer to wait until the whole of the evidence is in possession of our readers. We would say, however, that the method of solution is an obvious one. We do *not* want for our author a Greek, for no one accustomed to think and speak in Greek every day could possibly have used his author as our writer uses those to whom he is indebted—but a scholar of wide acquaintance with Christian and other Greek literature; not a polemical divine, for the Epistle bears little trace of any such hand, but still a man acquainted with theology, and, it may be, conversant with the alterations in theological diction which took place in the different ages of the Church. What other qualifications we may think that he should possess will depend very much upon the view which we take of the Strasburg MS. If, on consideration, our suspicion should rest upon any person, we shall then examine his books and writings, to see what, if any, similarities in thought and speech we can discover. We shall consider whether he was probably acquainted with the authors to whom the Epistle seems indebted, and, wherever possible, whether the particular treatises and passages used in the Epistle ever came specially under his eye.

3. The third point, viz. the objects which the author had

in view in writing the Epistle, must necessarily be postponed until the question of authorship is decided. These must be sought for, when the time comes, in the character and writings of the author.

We proceed now to give the evidence which we have to offer to the notice of our readers.

Prefatory Note on Name of Person addressed.

Otto (*Proleg.* p. 48), in his edition (1852) of the Epistle, enumerates twenty-six persons of the name of Diognetus. Of these he rejects at once twenty-five, as, under any view of the date of the Epistle, belonging to too early a period. Following the suggestion of Stephens, Otto accepts the remaining one, the Diognetus described by Capitolinus as the 'præceptor' of M. Aurelius Antoninus, A.D. 140 (say). This date excellently suits the theory of the authorship of Justin Martyr.

If, however, the conclusions which we draw from the evidence we have found are correct, this Diognetus cannot be the person addressed in our Epistle. No other seems to be known to later history. Can it be that the name was chosen as that of one who belonged to the times to which, probably, the writer wished this Epistle to be supposed to belong? Of course the name of Diognetus as that of the person addressed, and of Justin Martyr as the author of the Epistle, may be equally mistakes on the part of the transcriber of the MS. which Stephens used. If we entertain the notion that the name was deliberately chosen by our writer, we can, we think, find a passage which, if it came under his scholarly eye, would very naturally suggest the name.

It happens that Photius (*Cod.* 190), in his brief epitome of the six books of Ptolemy Hephaestion—condensed into little more than as many pages of Migne's edition, if we exclude the Latin translation—mentions two persons of the name of Diognetus, the one (p. 616) a prophet, the other (p. 625) a pugilist of Crete. It happens also that Photius, in a preceding page, speaks of eighteen persons who had the name of Helen, and in a following page, of fifty-four who bore the illustrious name of Achilles. Supposing this passage, then, to pass under the eye of our writer, what would be more natural than that he should inquire how many persons there might chance to be in the pages of history who had owned the name of Diognetus? We cannot help thinking that this passage from Photius induced Stephens to make that special examination of the subject which enabled him at once to suggest the 'præceptor' of the Emperor as the person most probably addressed in our Epistle. At any rate, if this passage is compared with Stephens' notes on the Oration, some very curious coincidences come to light.

(1.) Thus in the Oration we find in c. 1 the remarkable expres-

sion 'leprous shepherd' (λεπροῦ ποιμένος). Stephens pronounces it to be corrupt, and makes a suggestion as to which we shall have something to say when we deal with the Oration. He adds, however, that if any person should suggest as an alternative 'Lepraean' (Λεπραίων) it must be some place other than that spoken of by geographers. It happens, curiously enough, that only a few lines below the last mention of Diognetus by Photius, a place of that name is spoken of.

(2.) Again the Oration (c. 3) speaks of the lion which Hercules slew. Before the word 'lion' there was, so Stephens says, a gap in the 'very ancient' MS. which he used. He suggests one or other of two words to fill the gap. He is particular—he almost seems to go out of his way—to say that it must not be 'Nemæan' (Νεμεινίον). On the opposite page, however, to the last mention by Photius of Diognetus, the expression 'Nemæan lion' is twice used, as it is also twice used on a preceding page.

(3.) Once more, in the Oration (c. 1) we find Achilles spoken of as 'leaping over the river.' Upon this Stephens has a good deal to say, and he remarks that Lycophron speaks of a leap made by Achilles, though it could hardly be that spoken of by Justin (Stephens maintained the authorship of Justin). If now we turn over one page in Photius, we find a discussion of the epithet 'swift-footed' (ποδάρκης) as applied to Achilles. This discussion is prefaced by a reference to the poem by Lycophron, to which Stephens appeals.

(4.) There is yet one more point of contact (out of a good many) between these pages and the Oration, which we shall notice in this place. The epitome of Ptolemy is conspicuous for the constant confusion in the MSS. of *φησι* and *φασί*, 'he says' and 'they say.' Twice in the Oration 'they say' is used where 'he says' might be expected; and twice Stephens calls attention to the fact, and observes that if the use is not a mistake, it at least requires explanation.

These coincidences are certainly remarkable, and we have very good reason for supposing that they are not accidental. Photius' *Bibliotheca* was not printed and published until 1601. Stephens, however, possessed a MS., of which he made a transcript, and in which he wrote some conjectures and emendations, as we gather from the notes of D. Hoeschel, the first publisher of the *Bibliotheca*, and who used Stephens' transcript. From these notes we find that Stephens made an emendation in the very name of the place spoken of above, and that again and again he rectified the confusion in the expressions 'he says' and 'they say.'

This is not the place to speak of the bearing of these coincidences upon the 'Oration.' It is pertinent, however, to our present inquiry to remark that, if these coincidences are not accidental, there is strong presumption that other coincidences, which we proceed to bring to the notice of our readers, are also not accidental. We must add further, that it is plain that a coincidence must not be set aside merely because it is in itself slight. The fourth coincidence out of those noticed above is unquestionably slight in itself, yet, when taken with the others, is of some weight.

ΙΟΥΣΤΙΝΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΣ
ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΓΝΗΤΟΝ.

NOTE:—The text is that of Stephens. For convenience of reference, however, the ordinary division into chapters is retained, and the system of paragraphs used in the Dresselian edition of Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, Lipsiæ, 1875, is adopted. The editions used are, for the Fathers—Migne's, with the following exceptions:—Clement of Alexandria—Potter; Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Tatian, Athenagoras—Maran's edition, Venice, 1747; Hippolytus' Refutatio—Duncker, Göttingæ, 1859; Chrysostom—Wustius, Francofurti, 1698; Apostol. Constitutions—Ueltzen, Suerini, 1853; for other writers:—Philo—Mangey, Richter's edition, Lipsiæ, 1828. Rudimenta Fidei—Transl. H. Steph. 1563; Thesaurus Græcæ Linguae—H. Steph. 1572; Diogenes Laertius—Steph. ed. 1593; Josephus—Hudson, Oxonii, 1720; Plato—Bekker, Londini, 1826 (Stephens' pages); Lucian—Lehmann, Lipsiæ, 1822 (Reitz' pages); Origen. Contr. Cels.—Spencer. Cantab. 1677.

For the leading thought of the Epistle compare the following quotation:—'I was desirous of investigating the wisdom of the Christians also, and of hearing and seeing who they are, and when, and what is this its recent and strange production, or on what good things they rely who follow this wisdom, so as to speak the truth.'—Ambrose, 'a chief man of Greece.' Cureton, *Spic. Syr.* p. 61, London: 1855.

This short work, Mr. Cureton says, is the same, with some modifications, as that known by the title Λόγος πρὸς Ἑλλήνας—*Oratio ad Gentiles* (Pref. p. xi.). It is still in doubt whether this Ambrose was the friend and disciple of Origen, as Cureton supposes, and whether the Syriac version was indebted to the Oration, or the Oration to the Syriac.

CHAPTER I.

TEXT.

Ἐπειδὴ ὁρῶ, ¹κρά-
τιστε Διόγνητε, ²ὁ
περὶ σπουδακότα σε
τὴν θεοσεβίαν τῶν
Χριστιανῶν μαθεῖν,
καὶ πάνν σαφῶς καὶ
ἐπιμελῶς ³πυνθανό-
μενον περὶ αὐτῶν,
τίνι τε θεῷ πεποιθό-
τες καὶ πῶς θρησκεί-

PARALLELS.

Ἐπειδὴ . . . ἐγένετο λόγος ἡμῖν, THEO-
φίλου. ὦ ἀγαθότατε Αὐτόλυκε, πυνθόμενου
σου τίς μου ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ . . . περὶ
τῆς θεοσεβείας μου ἐξεθέμην σοι—
Ad Autol. ii. 1, p. 371.

Βουλθθέντος σου κατ' ἀκρίβειαν HIPPO-
λύτου. ἐμαθεῖν τὰ προτεθέντα σοι ὑπ' ἐμοῦ
κεφάλαια, ἀγαπητέ μου ἀδελφὲ Θεό-
φιλε . . . ἡγησάμην—*De Chr. et Anti-*
chr. § i. p. 726.

TEXT.

ΟΝΤΕΣ, αὐτὸν τε κόσ-
μον² ὑπερορῶσι πάν-
τες, καὶ ⁴θανάτου
⁵καταφρονοῦσι· καὶ
οὔτε τοὺς ⁶νομιζομέ-
νους ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑλλή-
νων θεοὺς λογιζονται,
οὔτε τὴν Ἰουδαίων
δαισινδαιμονίαν φυ-
λάσσουσι· καὶ τίνα
τὴν ⁷φιλοστοργίαν
ἔχουσι πρὸς ἀλλή-
λους· καὶ τί δὴ ποτε
⁸καινὸν τοῦτο γένος
ἢ ἐπιτηδεύμα εἰς-
ῆλθεν εἰς τὸν βίον

PARALLELS.

¹κράτιστε Θεόφιλε—*S. Luke* i. 3.
²ὑπερεσπουδακόσι. . . οὐ γὰρ CLEMENS
ἀναγκάζει ὁ Θεὸς, βία γὰρ ἐχθρὸν Θεῷ ALEX.
—*Quis Div. Salv.* § 10, p. 940.
πάνυ σαφῶς—*Protrept.* § 4, p. 50, STEPHENS
and *Rud. Fid.* ἐπιμελῶς—Ibid.
³τοὺς περὶ τοῦ ἀποστασίου πυνθα- CLEMENS
νομένους—*Strom.* iii. 6, p. 532. ALEX.
ὑπεριδῶν, κόσμον δὲ τόνδε— CLEMENS
Protrept. § 1, p. 5. ALEX.
⁴θανάτου δὲ ὁ καταφρονεῖν EUSEBIUS.
συμβουλευόν—*H. E.* iv. 16, p. 368.
⁵καταφρονουμένης, ὑπερορῶ- CLEMENS
μένης—*Strom.* i. 18, p. 371. ALEX.
⁶ἐνθένδε καὶ ἄθεοι κεκλημέθα. JUSTIN
καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομι- MART.

¹ Suggested by preceding Θεόφιλε. Stephens, in his *Dialogus de bene instituendis Græca Lingua Studiis*, gives a few lines of Greek for imitation and analysis. We find ὁ φίλτατε. On this he says, 'Quamvis in Latino sermone sit tantum *Philippe*, tamen in Græco præfigendum potius esse adverbium ὦ, et dicendum ὦ Φίλιππε: ut ab Isocrate scriptum esse videt ὦ Δημόνικε. Potius inquam præfigendum esse istud adverbium: quod ejus adjectio sit usitatio, quamvis alioqui interdum omittatur, a poetis præsertim.'—*Steph. Dial.* p. 102, ed. 1587. For other things see c. iii. 3, c. vii. 8, and for a remarkable coincidence in language, out of the same piece of Greek as above, see c. x. 4.

² A rare word, and noted by Westcott (p. 91) as 'among the peculiarities in the language of the letter.' The lexicons refer to Luc. Gymn. c. 9; but found also in Joseph. *Ant. Jud.* xv. 3, 6; Greg. Nyss. *S. Steph.* vol. 3, p. 713. Vide n. 7 *infr.* Cf. Ep. vii. 4.

³ 'Hisce in locis ante genitivum subaudiendum est παρὰ. . . Ex Plutarcho autem πυνθάνομαι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, de eisdem rebus consulo.'—*Steph. Thes.* vol. 3, p. 615.

⁴ Referred to by Stephens in his notes, p. 46; and he calls attention to this feature in the early Christian life.

⁵ This combination is not common. After quoting Ephes. iv. 24, &c., and Acts xvii. 22, &c. (both of which passages are commonly thought to have entered into the composition of our Epistle), Clement says, ἡ δὲ υἱὸς ἐπίγνωσις ἐστὶ τοῦ πατρὸς (vide Ep. x. 1). Compare *Apos. Constit.* v. 16, 3: μεταβάτες γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας ματαιοπύου συνηθείας (vide Ep. ii. 1) καὶ τῶν ἀψύχων εἰδῶλων ὑπεριδόντες καὶ τῶν ἐν σκότει δαιμόνων καταφρονήσαντες, προσδραμόντες τε τῷ φωτὶ καὶ ἀληθινῷ καὶ ἐπιγινόντες δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἕνα καὶ μόνον ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα. The fact of there being a connexion between our Epistle and each of these passages precludes the notion of an accidental resemblance. Our writer seems to delight in binding together, as it were, passages between which he sees a connexion. We have a remarkable instance of this further on in the Epistle. Vide note 2, *sup.*, and cf. c. vii. 4.

⁶ This passage is referred to by Stephens in his notes, p. 47.

TEXT.

⁹ νῦν, καὶ οὐ πρότερον · ¹⁰ ἀποδέχομαι γὰρ τῆς προθυμίας σε ταύτης, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ καὶ τὸ λέγειν καὶ τὸ ἀκούειν ἡμῖν χορηγούντος, αἰτούμαι δοθῆναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν, εἰπεῖν οὕτως ὡς μάλιστα ἀν' ¹¹ ἀκούσαι σε βελτίως γινέσθαι, ¹² σοὶ τε οὕτως ἀκούσαι ὡς μὴ λυπηθῆναι τὸν εἰπόντα.

PARALLELS.

ζομένων θεῶν ἄθιοι εἶναι—*Apol.* i. 6, p. 47.

πάσης δεισιδαιμονίας, *ab omni* STEPHENS.
superstitione—*Rud. Fid.* p. 100.

¹ φιλοστοργίας—ὑπερσπουδακῶς JOSEPHUS.
—*Antiq.* xv. 3, p. 667.

⁸ νέον ὁμολογουμένως ἔθνος . . . EUSEBIUS.
εἰ καὶ νέοι σαφῶς ἡμεῖς, καὶ τοῦτο

καινὸν ὄντως ὄνομα τὸ Χριστιανῶν ἀρτίως παρὰ πᾶσιν ἔθνεσι γνωρίζεται, ὁ βίος δ' οὖν ὁμοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀγωγῆς ὁ τρόπος—*H. E.* i. 4, pp. 76, 77.

τίς δὲ ἄνθρωπος εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸνδε τὸν βίον—*Ad Autol.* i. 12 p. 368.

τότε γὰρ—πρότερον δ' οὐ.—*Phaed.* PLATO.
p. 67.

⁹ νῦν δὲ ἐπεφάνη ἀνθρώποις αὐτὸς ὁ Λόγος . . . δεισιδαιμονίας—*Protrept.* § 1, p. 7.

τὰ τῷ ἐπιτηδεύματι αὐτοῦ καθήκοντα . . . ἐν τῷ νῦν βίῳ, *hic*—*Rud. Fid.* pp. 152, 127.

¹⁰ ἀποδέχομαι σου τὴν φιλομάθειαν—*Zeno*, lib. vii. p. 439.

¹ Vide nn. 2, 5 *supr.*

¹² Our Epistle is considerably indebted to Eusebius. For other things from this chapter, see Ep. c. v. 1, and c. iv. 1. To parallels add, καὶ μὴδ' αὐτῷ τῷ παρὰ Ἰουδαίους τιμωμένῳ Θεῷ—καινὴν δὲ τινα καὶ ἐρήμην ἀνοδιάν ἐαυτοῖς συντέμνει, μίτη τὰ Ἑλλήνων, μίτη τὰ Ἰουδαίων φυλάττουσαν; Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* i. 2, p. 28; and ἀγάλματα καὶ ἰδρύματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαν Ἰουδαϊκὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν—*Orig. Contr. Cels.* vii. p. 359. See c. v. 17.

⁹ The νῦν is very emphatic, and repeated by Clement a great many times. Great use is made of this treatise by our writer.

¹⁰ Observe the change of construction in the use of this verb:—'Sed nota est verbi ἀποδέχεσθαι structura.'—Otto. *Ep. Diog.* p. 98. 'Cum accusativo etiam personæ (uti dixi) sed rarius construitur.'—Steph. *Thes.* vol. i. p. 956. Cf. πῶς οὐ μᾶλλον τῆς εὐλαβείας ἀποδεξόμεθα Χριστιανούς;—*Orig. Contr. Cels.* i. p. 20. Almost immediately preceding the passage from John Damasc. we find the expression ἐξ ἀγάπης (Ep. xi. 8), and, turning over one leaf, we find ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν (Ep. vi. 1), and a passage which is used in Ep. xi. 5. With the quotation from Diog. Laert. cf. ἐὰν νῦν ἀποδεχόμεθα αὐτὰ ὡς . . . εὐμαθεῖς τε ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγαν φιλομαθείας ὄντες. Si ipsum amplectimur . . . si nos illi dociles præbamus.—*Rud. Fid.* p. 208. The Latin original does not seem to necessitate the use of φιλομαθείας. The καθήκοντα of preceding parallel comes apparently from the same source: *vid. Diog. Laert.*

TEXT.

PARALLELS.

εἴτε τοῦ αἰτοῦντος τοῦτο παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως, εἴτε τοῦ βασιλέως ¹⁰ ἀποδεχομένου τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τὴν πίστιν τοῦ ζητούντος παρὰ τοῦ θεράποντος αὐτοῦ—*De Imag.* iii. 33, p. 1352. JOHN DAM.

αἰτοῦμαι παρὰ σοῦ (τοῦ Θεοῦ), *peto ut.*—*Rud. Fid.* p. 336. STEPHENS.

τῷ μὲν λέγοντι . . . τῷ δὲ ἀκούοντι, ἐπιστῆσαι τὸν νοῦν πρὸς τὰ λεγόμενα. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ κάματος κοινὸς ἀμφοτέροις πρόκειται, τῷ μὲν λέγοντι τὸ ἀκίνδυνον ἐξειπεῖν, τῷ δὲ ἀκούοντι πιστῶς ¹¹ ἀκούσαντα καταδέξασθαι τὰ λεγόμενα, παρακαλῶ συναγωνίσασθαι μοι ἐν τῇ πρὸς Θεὸν δεήσει—*De Chr. et Antichr.* § 2, p. 729. HIPPO-
LYTUS.

¹² βελτίω γεγονότα—βελτίους γεγονέναι.—*Gorg.* pp. 514, 515. PLATO.

CHAPTER II.

§ 1. ἄγε δὴ, καθάρας σεαυτὸν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ³ προκατεχόντων σου τὴν διάνοιαν λογισμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἀπατώσάν σε συνήθειαν ἀποσκευασάμενος, καὶ γενόμενος ὥσπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καινὸς ἀν-

§ 1. ἄγε δὴ—*Rud. Fid.* pp. 187, 239, &c. STEPHENS.

ὅτι τοῦ μέλλοντος ἱεροῦς νόμους παραδέχεσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν ¹—ἐκκαθήρασθαι τὰς δυσεκπλύτους κηλίδας—*De Dec.* § 2, p. 181. PHILO.

² ἐκκαθάραντες ὑμῶν τὸν λογισμὸν ἀπὸ τῶν βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων, καὶ εὐρύναντες ὑμῶν τὸ πλατὸς τῆς διανοίας μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς προθυμίας CHRYSTOM.

p. 503, where it is often used. On this same page we find the words, γυνέων ἀμελεῖν, συγγενῶν ἀφρονιστεῖν. Cf. ἀμελεῖν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἀφρονιστεῖν ἔδοκεῖ, *Ep.* viii. 10; and ἵνα μὴ ἕκαστος ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιμελούμενος, τῶν ἄλλων ἀφρονιστῶς ἔχει. *Rud. Fid.* p. 180. Stephens uses also ἀμελεῖν several times, e.g. pp. 49, 50. *Vide Ep.* ii. 4, n. 10.

¹¹ Stephens conjectured ἀκούσαντα; and, presently, σοὶ δὲ for σοὶ τε.

¹² βελτίων is used often in this treatise. For another common expression from same source see following chapter.

¹ Suggesting the reference to Chrysostom and to 2 Tim. 20, 21.—Cf. τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς κηλὶδα ἀποκαθαίρων—*Rud. Fid.* p. 55.

² This passage must be compared with the close of preceding chapter.

TEXT.

θρῶπος, ὡς ἂν καὶ
λόγου ⁴καινοῦ, (κα-
θάπερ καὶ αὐτὸς
ὡμολόγησας) ἀκροα-
τὴς ἐσόμενος· ἴδε μὴ
μόνον τοῖς ὀφθαλ-
μοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ
τῇ φρονήσει, τίς
⁵ὑποστάσεις ἢ τίς
εἶδους τυγχάνουσιν
οὐκ ⁶ἐρεῖτε καὶ ἰο-
μίζετε θεοῦς.

PARALLELS.

δέχεσθε τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος
χορηγούμενα—*Hom. ix. In Gen.*
c. i. vol 2, p. 72.

μετὰ διαπύρου προθυμίας τοσαύ-
την παρ' αὐτοῦ δέχεσθαι εὐεργεσίαν
—μετὰ προθυμίας πολλῆς ἐπι-
δέχεσθαι. . . φρονήσεως χορηγὸν
Πνεῦμα—*Rud. Fid.* pp. 292, 336.

ἡ ψυχὴ τῶν τοῦ σώματος ³προκατ-
εχομένη παθῶν—*Expos. Rect. Fid.*
§ 11, p. 459.

μεταβίωτες γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς προτέρας
ματαιοπόνου συνηθείας—*Lib. v. 16, p.*
120.

συνήθεια often in *Protrept.*; e.g.
οἶον δηλητήριον φάρμακον τὴν συν-
θειαν ἀπωσάμενοι—§ 10, p. 73.

Cf. Ephes. iv. 24, &c., quoted
Strom. i. 18, p. 371.

καινὸς ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος—
Contr. Noet. § 17, p. 828.

⁴χρὴ γὰρ εἶναι καινοὺς τοὺς Λόγον
καινοῦ μετεληφότας—*Pæd. i. 5, p.*
110.

ὁ σὺ πολλάκις ὡμολόγησας—ὡς
σὺ ὡμολόγηεις—*Gorg.* pp. 522, 497, and
often.

ἀκροαταὶ μόνον γενόμενοι τοῦ
(καινοῦ) ἄσματος—*Protrept.* § 1, p. 5.
ἀκροατὴς ἐσόμενος (*Joseph. Ant.*

STEPHENS.

PS. JUS-
TIN.AP.
CONST.CLEMENS
ALEX.CLEMENS
ALEX.HIPPO-
LYTUS.CLEMENS
ALEX.

PLATO.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

EUSEBIUS.

³ Noted by Canon Westcott, p. 91. 'προκατεχω, præcoerceo, præ-
occupo.'—*Steph. Thes.* vol. i. p. 1348. No example given.

⁴ 'Hoc repositum e Pal. MS. In *Flor.* edit. perperam esse χρὴ
γὰρ εἶναι καινοὺς τοὺς λόγους, καινοῦ μετεληφότας.'—*Sylburg.*

⁵ 'Ego, licet hic sub hypostasi comprehendi materiam putarem,
tamen hoc uti vocabulo ausus non sum, quod non sine causa Justinum
ὑπόστασιν, non ὄλην, dixisse existimarem. Ac ne *substantiam* quidem
ausus fui interpretari, quod illum ne οὐσίας quidem appellatione usum
esse viderem.'—*Steph. notes*, p. 99.

⁶ *Cf. Χερουβιμ οὕτως εἰρημίνων*—*Just. Cohort. c. 31, p. 30.* 'Cæte-
rum miretur quis ἐπεῖτε in præsentis significatione, et suspectum
habeat: ut autem ipse non valde mirer faciant quæ in Thesaurο de
thematē ἐρίω dixi.'—*Steph. notes*, p. 48. 'ἐπεῖτε idem St. defendit
ex Thesaurο suo; potest tamen etiam αἰπεῖτε legi, utriusque lectionis
exempla suppledat index noster in Clementem, et notæ ad 314.'—
Sylburg.

TEXT.

PARALLELS.

Jud. i. 8, p. 22)—*Præp. Evang.* ix. 16, p. 705.

ἐπιστῆσαι τὸν νοῦν πρὸς τὰ λεγόμενα—*De Chr. et Antichr.* § 2, p. 729.

HIPPO-
LYTUS.

νοῦν ἐὰν εἴπω, φρόνησιν αὐτοῦ λέγω—*Ad Autol.* i. 3, p. 362.

THEO-
PHILUS.

ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι· σὺ ὁ βλέπων, διηγῆσαι μοι τὸ εἶδος τοῦ Θεοῦ—*Ad Autol.* i. 3, p. 361.

THEO-
PHILUS.

οἱ δὲ ἐνύβρισαν καὶ τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ὑποστάσει καὶ τῇ ἀρχῇ· οὗτός τε ὁ τῆς ὕλης καὶ τῶν ἐκ αὐτῇ εἰδῶν ἀρχων—*Leg. pro Christ.* § 24, p. 322.

ATHENA-
GORAS.

§ 2. τίς οὐχ ὁ μέν τις λίθος ἐστίν, ὅμοιος τῷ πατουμένῳ; ὁ δ' ἐστὶ χαλκός, οὐ κρείσσων τῶν εἰς τὴν χρῆσιν ἡμῶν κεχαλκευμένων; ὁ δὲ, ξύλον, ἤδη καὶ σεσηπός; ὁ δὲ, ἄργυρος, χρήζων ἀνθρώπου τοῦ φυλάξοντος, ἵνα μὴ κλαπῇ; ὁ δὲ, σιδήρος, ὑπὸ ἰού διεφθαρμένος; ὁ δὲ, ὄστρακον, οὐδὲν τοῦ κατεσκευασμένου πρὸς τὴν ἀτιμοτάτην ὑπηρεσίαν εὐπρεπέστερον;

CLEMENS
ALEX.

ὡς γὰρ ὁ κεραμεὺς—ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ πηλὸς καθ' ἑαυτὸν σκευὴ γενέσθαι χωρὶς τέχνης ἀδύνατος—ὡς δὲ οὐ τὸν κέραμον προτιμότερον—τοῦ χαλκεύσαντος—*Leg. pro Chr.* § 15, p. 309.

ATHENA-
GORAS.

ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ὕλη, χαλκός ἐστιν· τί δαὶ χαλκὸς δύναται καθ' αὐτόν; ὃν μεταποιῆσαι πάλιν εἰς ἕτερον σχῆμα ἔξεστιν, ὡς τὸν ποδονιπτῆρα ὁ παρὰ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ Ἀμασις—*Leg. pro Christ.* § 26, p. 324.

ATHENA-
GORAS.

λίθοι, καὶ ξύλα—λιθοτόμων καὶ δρυοτόμων τῆς συμφύτας αὐτὰ διακοψάντων, ὧν τὰ ἀδελφὰ μέρη καὶ συγ-

PHILO.

⁷ 'Hic non ἐκ σιδήρου, sed ὑπὸ σιδήρου dicit: ferrum vocans instrumenta ferrea, quæ ignis operam requirunt: ideoque addit ἐκ πυρός.'—Steph. notes, p. 49. Stephens, we suppose, supplied ἐκ before πυρός, for it is not in the text. Cf. ὅτι θεός ἐστιν οὐ ξύλον, οὐ λίθος, οὐ χαλκός, οὐκ ἄλλο τι ἐκ φθαρτῆς γερονὸς ὕλης. ἡ γὰρ οὐχ ὑπὸ σιδήρου ἐτορεύθησαν, καὶ ὁ τορεύσας σιδήρος ὑπὸ πυρός ἐμαλάχθη—Clem. *Hom.* xi. p. 292.

⁸ ἰοβ.—διαφθ. These words are found nearly close together several times in Philo (*vide* c. iii. 5, n. 16). The etymology of ἰοβ. apparently reminded our author of the passage in S. James's Epistle, from which, according to his wont, he took some things into his own document.

TEXT.

PARALLELS.

§ 3. οὐ φθαρτῆς
ἕλης ταῦτα πάντα;
οὐχ ἵπῳ σιδήρου
καὶ πυρὸς κεχαλκευ-
μένα; οὐχ ὃ μὲν
αὐτῶν, λιθοξόος, ὃ
δὲ χαλκεὺς, ὃ δὲ,
ἀργυροκόπος, ὃ δὲ,
κεραμεὺς ἐπλασεν;
οὐ πρὶν ἢ ταῖς τέχ-
ναις τούτων εἰς τὴν
μορφὴν τούτων ἐκ-
τυπωθῆναι, ἣν ἕκασ-
τος αὐτῶν ἐκάστω,
ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὁ μετα-
μορφωμένον; οὐ
τὰ νῦν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς
ἕλης ὄντα σκεύη
γένονται ἂν, εἰ τύχοι
τῶν αὐτῶν τεχνιτῶν,
ὁμοία¹⁰ τοιοῦτοις;

§ 4. οὐ ταῦτα πάλιν
τὰ νῦν ὑφ' ἡμῶν
προσκυνούμενα δύ-
ναιτ' ἂν ὑπὸ ἀνθρώ-
πων σκευὴ ὁμοία
γενέσθαι τοῖς λοι-

γενῇ λουτροφόροι γηγόνασι καὶ ποδό-
νιπτρα, καὶ ἄλλα ἅττα τῶν ἀτιμοτέ-
ρων—⁸ ἰοβόλα—διαφθειρόμενα—
De Vit. Cont. § 1, p. 472.

ἄγε νῦν—ὁ πλοῦτος ἡμῶν σέσηπε N. TEST.
—καὶ ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν—*Jas.* v. 1-3.

φύλαξ—*vide* § 7. PHILO.

μορφώσαντες ἰδέας—καὶ βωμοὺς
κατασκευάσαντες ἀγάλμασι—*De*
Dec. § 2, p. 181. PHILO.

σκεύη—ὁ στράκινα, κ.τ.λ. εἰς οὖν N. TEST.
τις ἐκκαθάρη, κ.τ.λ.—2 *Tim.* ii. 20, 21.

§ 3. πῶς ἂν γένοιτο τὰ ἐκ τυπώματα
χωρὶς τῆς ἕλης, ἢ τοῦ τεχνίτου;—*Leg.*
pro Chr. § 19, p. 314. ATHENA-
GORAS.

ἀργυροκόποι—*De Heres.* § 3, p. 680. JOHN DAM.

οἱ λιθοξόοι—*Protrep.* § 4, p. 51. CLEMENS
ALEX.

ἕλη νεκρά, τεχνίτου χειρὶ ὁ μεμορφω-
μένη—ἀναίσθητον ἕλην μὴ σέβειν—
ἣν φησιν ὁ Νίκανδρος τυφλὴν τε σμερδ-
νὴν τε· ἀλλά γε ἀμείνους εἰς τῶν ξοά-
νων τούτων καὶ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων, τέλειον
ὄντων κωφῶν· ἔχουσι γὰρ αἰσθῆσιν
—τὰ ἀναίσθητα—*Ib.* § 4, p. 45.

ἀργυρὸν τε καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ τὰ πα-
ραπλησίους ἕλας μορφωσάντων ὡς
φίλον ἐκάστοις—*De Dec.* § 14, p. 191. PHILO.

§ 4. ἄψυχος ἕλη καὶ ἀκίνητος— PHILO.
De Vit. Cont. § 1, p. 472.

¹⁰ ὁμοία τούτοις (*vid. Orat. ad*
Græc. § 5, p. 5)—*Zeno.* lib. vii. p. 503.
τοὺς καλουμένους θεοὺς—*Pro-*
trept. § 2, p. 11. CLEMENS
ALEX.

⁸ 'Sed libentius etiam μεμορφωμένον legerem.'—Steph. notes,
p. 49.

¹⁰ 'Non dubito quin ὁμοία τούτοις, non ὁμοία τοιοῦτοις, scribendum
sit.'—Steph. notes, p. 49. *Vide* Ep. i. n. 10.

TEXT.	PARALLELS.	
ποῖς; οὐ κωφὰ πάν- τα; οὐ τυφλά; οὐκ ἄψυχα; οὐκ ἀνασ- θητα; οὐκ ἀκίνητα; οὐ πάντα σηπόμενα; οὐ πάντα φθειρό- μενα;	τοιούτους προσκυνούντες θεοὺς— <i>Protrept.</i> § 2, p. 33. τούτους . . . προσκυνεῖτε— <i>Contr.</i> <i>Græc.</i> § 12, p. 268. τέλος εὐδαιμονίας, τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ἐξομώσωσιν. εὐχέσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς ¹² ἐξο- μωθῆναι τοῖς ἀφιδρύμασιν— <i>De Dec.</i> § 15, p. 193.	CLEMENS ALEX. TATIAN. PHILO.
§ 5. ταῦτα θεοὺς καλεῖτε, τούτοις δου- λεύετε, τούτοις προσκυνεῖτε· τέλεόν τε * ¹¹ ἐξομωθῆτε. ¹²	§ 5. δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὃ τι ποτ' εἰς θεοί (<i>vid. Ep. viii. 1</i>)—(<i>Orestes</i>). παρόν γε κ' ¹² ἐξομωθῆναι θεοῖς (<i>Philoctetes</i>)— <i>De Monarch.</i> § 5, pp. 40, 41. κεκληθῆναι θεοὺς—προσκυνήσω- μεν αὐτοῖς— ¹² ἐξομωθῆσομένους ἐκείνοις τοῖς θεοῖς (<i>Dion. Alex.</i>)— <i>Præp. Evang.</i> xiv. 27, p. 1288.	JUSTIN. MART. EUSEBIUS.
§ 6. διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖτε Χριστιανούς, ὅτι τούτους οὐχ ἡγούνται θεοὺς.	§ 6. ¹³ καὶ εἰ μὴ τοῖς τινῶν νομίμοις συγχρηθῆναι βούλομαι, τίνος χάριν καθ- άπερ μαρώτατος μεμίσσηται— <i>Orat.</i> <i>contr. Græc.</i> § 4, p. 260.	TATIAN.

¹¹ 'Puto pronomen αὐτοῖς hanc lacunulam apte completurum esse: et alludi ad imprecationem Psalmographi.'—Steph. notes, p. 49. 'Cod. Argent. confirm.' *Otto*, p. 84. Stephens refers to ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς γίνονται οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτά—Ps. 113, 12. In Athan. *Orat. contr. Gentes*, we find this quotation, and only a few lines above, these words, καὶ τότε θαυμαστόν, ὅτι οὗς αὐτὸς φυλάττουσιν (*Ep.* ii. 2) ὑπεξουσίαν ἔχοντες, τούτοις ὡς δεσπόταις δουλεύουσι. (The last half of this sentence will give one clause of § 5; while the first half, together with the following from the same page, might well have been used in § 2.) οὐχ ὁρώσιν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν ὅμοια τοῖς ποσὶ πατοῦσι καὶ καίουσιν—ἀ—εἰς χρῆσιν εἶχον—εἴ τι τοσούτων ταῦτα πατοῦσι, καὶ τούτοις εἰς ὑπηρεσίας τὰς αὐτῶν πολλάκις καὶ τὰς ἀτιμωτέρας χρώνται—ἐπειδὴ δ' ὁ τεχνίτης—εἰς τὴν ὕλην σχῆμα τυπώσῃ. Cf. *Ep.* ii. 3. On p. 16 we find ὅτι ὥξυνε τέκτων σιδήρων. (*Is.* xlv. 12, quoted.) Cf. ὑπὸ σιδήρου, *Ep.* ii. 2. There are also other things in this treatise, as well as in the following one (*De Incarn. Verb. Dei*), which is almost part of it, but which we observed too late for a place among the parallels: e.g. p. 1, ποθοῦντι δέ σοι ὁμος τὰ περὶ ταύτης ἀκοῦσαι (cf. *Ep.* iii. i.); p. 8, ἐξ ἀρχῆς γέγονεν—Athan. *Op.*: Colonia, 1686.

¹² Observe the way in which the passages from Dion. Alex. and Justin are used, as well as that from Philo, from whom apparently the idea is taken. See § 7 for a continuation of the passage from Philo.

¹³ Just below this passage, and in the same section and page, Tatian writes, πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, οὐ δῆκον διὰ τῆς ὕλης—τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀόρατον τοῖς ποιήμασι καταλαμβάνόμεθα—πνεῦμα γὰρ τὸ διὰ τῆς ὕλης δῆκον. Cf. εἶτι δὲ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ὡς αὐτοῦ δύναμιν, τὴν διὰ πάντων μὲν δῆκονσαν.—*Rud. Fid.* p. 19.

TEXT.

PARALLELS.

§ 7. ὑμεῖς γὰρ οἱ
νῦν¹⁴ νομίζοντες καὶ
οἰόμενοι, οὐ πολὺ
πλέον αὐτῶν κατα-
φρονεῖτε; οὐ πολὺ
μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς
χλευάζετε καὶ ὑβρι-
ζετε, τοὺς μὲν λιθι-
νους καὶ ὀστρακί-
νους σέβοντες ἀφυ-
λάκτους,¹⁶ τοὺς δὲ
ἀργυρέους καὶ χρυ-
σοὺς ἐγκλείοντες
ταῖς νυξί, καὶ ταῖς
ἡμέραις φύλακας
παρακαθίσαντες, ἵνα
μὴ κλαπῶσιν.

εἰ θεοὺς νομίζετε, μὴ θρηνεῖτε
αὐτοὺς, μηδὲ κόπτεσθε· εἰ δὲ πενθεῖτε αὐ-
τοὺς, μηκέτι τούτους ἡγεῖσθε¹⁴ εἰναὶ
θεοὺς—*Protrept.* § 2, p. 21.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

§ 7. καὶ ταύτην μεγίστην οἰόμενοι
θεὸν—*Protrept.* § 4, p. 44.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

καταφρονούντες δ' ὁμῶς τῶν ἀγαλ-
μάτων—*Protrept.* § 4, p. 46.

CLE MENS
ALEX.

μᾶλλον δὲ ἐμπαίζοντες καὶ ἐνυ-
βρίζοντες σφίσιν αὐτοῖς—*Protrept.*
§ 2, p. 33.

CLEMENS.
ALEX.

¹⁵ Διονύσιος μὲν γὰρ ὁ τύραννος—
θοιμάτιον τὸ χρύσειον περιελομένος Διὸς
ἐν Σικελίᾳ, προσέτοξεν αὐτῷ ἔρεοῦν
περιτιθέναι—'Αντίοχος—τοῦ Διὸς τὸ
ἀγαλματὸ χρυσοῦν—προσέταξε χωνεῦσθαι
—οὔτε 'Επιδαυριοῦ 'Ἀσκληπιοῦ—
Protrept. § 4, p. 46.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

ἀνοήτους¹⁶ ἀφυλάκτως εἰς τὰς
ἐαυτῶν ἐμβάλλουσι πάγας· ὥστε τὰ
μὲν τῆς ἀσεβείας ἴσα αὐτοῖς καὶ 'Ελ-
λῃσι (*cf. Ep. iii. 5*). τὰ δὲ τῆς ἀπατῆς
(*Ep. iv. 6*)—*Adv. Jud. i. vol. 1, p.*
394.

CHRYSO-
STOM.

¹⁷ ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐν εἰρκῇ τῷ ἱερῷ
φρουρούμενοι καὶ φυλαττόμενοι, μεθ'

PHILO.

¹⁴ 'Pro nūn (οἱ νῦν νομίζ.) fortasse scribendum sit εἶναι. Quorsum enim qui nunc existimatis, diceret?'—Steph. notes, p. 50. *Cf.* ταῦτα ὑβρίσαντες, οὓς καὶ θεοὺς εἶναι ἐνόμισαν.—Clem. *Hom. vi. 17, p. 210.*

¹⁵ 'De his custodibus jam fuit a Justino in fine pag. primæ, et a me ibi alius hujus factum (*Dionysii*) ab eo commemorari potuisset, tanquam exemplum non modo contemptus deorum, sed etiam irrisionis atque adeo injuriæ illis factæ: (nam tria ista ab eo hic ponuntur, non tantum dicente καταφρονεῖτε, sed addente χλευάζετε καὶ ὑβρίζετε) quum invitis custodibus (si qui tamen custodes adhibiti erant) Iovi Olympio amiculum aureum detraxit, et laneum pallium hujus loco ei inject; et quum Æsculapio Epidaurio barbam auream ademit.'—Steph. notes, p. 50. For another example of felicitous illustration, see *Ep. vi. 9.*

¹⁶ 'Pro ἀφυλάκτως idem (St.) edidit ἀφυλάκτους, custodibus carentes, eamque lectionem omnes editores retinuerunt. Sed veror ne vir doctus in culpa sit, non codex mstus quo usus est. Certe scripturam a me receptam, eamque haud contemnendam, præbet apographon Beur., eamdemque codex Argent. indicat.'—Otto, p. 85.

¹⁷ Philo has just spoken of the lack of sight, speech, motion, &c. The sentence follows the words given in § 5 (*vid. note 13*). Stephens refers to *Just. Apol. i. 9, p. 48*, where φύλακας is similarly used. *Cf. πῶς*

TEXT.

§ 8. αἷς δὲ δοκεῖτε τιμαῖς προσφέρειν, εἰ μὲν αἰσθάνονται, κολάζετε μᾶλλον αὐτούς· εἰ δὲ ἀναισθητοῦσιν, ἐλέγχοντες, αἵματι καὶ κίνισαις αὐτοὺς θρησκευέτε.

§ 9. ταῦθ' ὑμῶν τις ὑπομεινάτω· ταῦτα ἀνασχέσθω τις ἑαυτῷ γενέσθαι. ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωπος μὲν οὐδὲ εἰς ταύτης τῆς κολάσεως ἐκὼν ἀνέξεται· (αἰσθησιν γὰρ ἔχει καὶ λογισμόν) ὁ δὲ λίθος ἀνέχεται. ἀναισθητεῖ γάρ. οὐκοῦν τὴν¹⁹ αἰσθησιν * ἐλέγχετε.

§ 10. περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ μὴ²⁰ δεδουλώσθαι Χριστιανούς τοιοῦτοις θεοῖς, πολ-

PARALLELS.

ἡμέραν τε καὶ νύκτωρ τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν θυομένων αἰεὶ καπνὸν σπώντας—*De Dec.* § 15, p. 193.

§ 8. τὴν ἀναισθησίαν οὐκ ἐκδικούντων τοῖς ἀγάλμασι—¹⁸ εἰ γὰρ ὡς ἀναισθητοὺς ὑβρίζουσιν, τί προσκυνοῦσιν ὡς θεοὺς; εἰ δὲ αἰσθήσεως αὐτοὺς μετέχειν οἴονται, τί τούτους ἰσθῶσι θυρωροῦς;—*Protrept.* § 4, p. 44.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἀναισθητῶ λίθῳ—οὐθ' ὅτι οὐκ μέλει, οὐκ κνίσσης, οὐχ αἵματος, οὐ καπνοῦ, ᾧ δὴ τιμώμενοι καὶ τυφόμενοι, ἐκμεταίονται—*Protrept.* § 4, p. 45.

§ 9. οὐδὲ μιᾶς αἰσθήσεως μετέχει τὰ ἀγάλματα—ἀργὰ, ἀπρακτά, ἀναισθητά, προσδεῖται, καὶ προσκαθηλoutai, καὶ προσπρίγνεται, χωνεύεται, ῥιναῖται, πρίεται, περιξέεται, γλύφεται—ἔχουσι γὰρ αἰσθησιν—*Protrept.* § 4, p. 45.

ἐλέγχειν constantly in *Protrept.*; and cf. αἱ γραφαὶ ἐλέγχουσιν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀμαθίαν—*Contra Noct.* § 3, p. 808.

¹⁹ εἰς ἐλεγχον ἀναισθησίας—*Vit. Philo. Mos.* i. § 49, p. 123.

§ 10. δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ—*Rom.* vi. 9. Quoted *Strom.* iv. 3, p. 568.

²¹ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα—τόδε *PLATO.*

οὖν αὐτοὺς θεοὺς νενομίκατε ὑπ' ἀνθρωπίνων νόμων ἐκδικουμένους, ὑπὸ κυνῶν φρουρουμένους, ὑπὸ ὄχλων φυλασσομένους; καὶ ταῦτα ἐὰν χρύσεια ἢ ἀργύρεα, ἢ χαλκᾶ· τὰ γὰρ λίθινα ἢ ὀστράκινα ὑπὸ τῆς ἀτιμίας φυλάσσεται, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων λίθινον ἢ ὀστράκινον ὀρέγεται κλέψαι θεόν.—*Clem. Hom.* x. 8, p. 264.

¹⁸ 'Nam ubi legimus εἰ γὰρ ὡς κ.τ.λ. ferri non posse dico illum ὑβρίζουσιν, et mutandum esse in ἰδρύουσι:—quum tamen manifestum sit dicere illum philosophum voluisse, si enim tanquam insensiles (sive omni sensu carente) illos statuunt, cur adorant?'—*Sched. Var.* v. 20, p. 226, ed. 1578.

¹⁹ 'Scripserat fortasse τὴν αἰσθησιν οὐκ ἔχειν ἐλέγχετε. Alioqui non αἰσθησιν sed ἀναισθησίαν dicendum fuisset.'—*Steph. notes*, p. 51.

²⁰ Stephens lays great stress on the δεδουλώσθαι. See *Ep.* vii. 2.

²¹ Stephens, in his discourse on the Attic dialect, p. 35, writes:

TEXT.

λά μὲν ²¹ καὶ ἄλλα
εἰπεῖν ἔχοιμι· εἰ δέ
τιμι μὴ δοκοῖ καὶ
ταῦτα ἱκανά, περισ-
σὸν ἡγοῦμαι καὶ τὸ
* ²² λέγειν.

PARALLELS.

ἱκανῶς ἔχεις λέγειν—*De Rep.* pp.
595, 399.

²¹ πολλὰς μὲν καὶ ἄλλας—First STEPHENS.
words pref. *Rud. Fid.*

πολλὰ δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλα λέγοιτο— ORIGEN.
περισσὸν ἡγησάμην—*Contr. Cels.* 20, 14.

CHAPTER III.

§ 1. Ἐξῆς δὲ, περὶ
τοῦ μὴ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ
Ἰουδαίους ¹ θεοσε-
βεῖν αὐτοὺς, οἶμαι
σε μάλιστα ποθεῖν
ἀκοῦσαι.

§ 1. ὅτι μὴ κοινῶς ἐκείνοις ¹ θεοσε-
βοῦμεν, ἀσεβῶμεν, πᾶσαι μὲν πόλεις,
πάντα δὲ ἔθνη ἀσεβοῦσιν· οὐ γὰρ τοὺς
αὐτοὺς πάντες ἄγουνσι θεοὺς—*Leg. pro*
Christ. § 14, p. 309.

² οὐτ' οὖν σώματος αὐτοῖς περιτομῆς
ἔμελεν, ὅτι μὴδὲ ἡμῖν οὐ σαββάτων
ἐπιτηρήσεως, ὅτι μὴδὲ ἡμῖν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ
τῶν τοιῶνδε τροφῶν παραφυλακῆς, οὐδὲ
τῶν ἄλλων διαστολῆς, ὅσα τοῖς μετέ-
πειτα πρώτος ἀπάντων Μωϋσῆς ἀρξά-
μενος ἐν συμβόλοις τελεῖσθαι παραδί-
δωκεν, ὅτι μὴδὲ νῦν Χριστιανῶν τὰ
τοιαῦτα—*H. E.* i. 4, p. 77.

§ 2. Ἰουδαῖοι τοί-
νυν εἰ μὲν ἀπέχου-
νται ταύτης τῆς
προειρημένης λα-

§ 2. ³ ποθοῦμεν γὰρ ἰδεῖν—εἰ μὲν
γὰρ τοῦ ἀοράτου Θεοῦ εἰκόνα ἐποιοῦμεν
ὄντως ἡμαρτάνομεν—εἰ ἐποιοῦμεν
εἰκόνας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ταύτας θεοὺς

‘Ultimum autem genus pleonasmī particulæ καὶ—*Thuc.* iii. p. 109:
καὶ ἐπέπεσε πολλὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ. Hic quoque (si mihi creditur) vocola
καὶ inter πολλὰ et χαλεπὰ πλεονάζειν dicenda est.’ Stephens’ Greek
preface to *Dionys. Halic. Resp.* supplies an illustration: ‘ἀντὶ πολλῶν
καὶ μεγάλων, ὃν σοι ὑπεσχόμην, ὀλίγα τινὰ καὶ μικρὰ πέμπω σοι.’ Cf. ταῦτα
μὲν οὖν, μικρὰ ἀπὸ μεγάλων, καὶ ὀλίγα ἀπὸ πολλῶν, ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλείον ὑμῖν
ἐνοχλοῖμεν.—*Athenag. Leg. pro Chr.* § 12, p. 307.

²² ‘Deesse puto plerū ante λέγειν.’—Steph. notes, p. 52. ‘Idem
(Beurerus) legit καὶ τὰ πλείω λέγειν. Supersunt autem (si bene
memini) in illo quo usi sumus exemplari quædam literarum π et λ
vestigia.’—Steph. notes, p. 99. ‘Et hanc lectionem Argentoratensis
confirmat: evidenter in eo habetur prima manu.’—Otto, p. 86.

¹ Not in common use. ‘Θεοσεβίω ὦ, Deum colo. apud Chry-
sostomum opponitur τῷ εἰδωλολατρίῳ, ut testatur B.’—Steph. *Thes.*
vol. i. p. 1526. He gives no other example of the use of the word.

² This Chapter has been already referred to by our writer. The
various points are taken up in Ep. ch. iv.

³ The passage from which these things are taken contains only
two lines. Our writer seems to have consulted this treatise. For
expressions relating to divine worship cf. Stephens’ *Thesaurus* under

TEXT.

τρεῖς, καὶ εἰς θεὸν
ἓνα τῶν πάντων
σέβειν καὶ δεσπότην
ἀξιούσι φρονεῖν· εἰ
δὲ τοῖς προειρη-
μένοις ὁμοιότητως
τὴν θρησκείαν προσ-
άγουσιν αὐτῷ ταύ-
την, διαμαρτάνουσιν.

§ 3. ἃ γὰρ τοῖς
ἀναισθήτοις καὶ κω-
φοῖς προσφέροντες
οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀφρο-
σύνης δαίγμα παρέ-
χουσι, ταῦθ' οὗτοι
καθάπερ προσδεο-
μένῳ τῷ θεῷ λογι-
ζόμενοι παρέχειν,
μωρίαν εἰκὸς μάλ-

PARALLELS.

ἡγούμεθα, καὶ ὡς θεοῖς ἐλατρεύομεν,
ὀντως ἡσεβούμεν—*De Imag.* ii. 5, p.
1288.

ἀλλ' ὅσοι μὲν ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ
τοῦ σύμπαντος οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐ-
τοῖς ὀλοσχερεστάτων μερῶν ὡς θεῶν
πρόπολι τε καὶ θεραπεύται, διαμαρ-
τάνουσι μὲν—*De Dec.* § 14, p. 191.

ὃν—εἰς θεὸν τετιμήκασιν—*Strom.* CLEMENS
ALEX.
i. p. 15, p. 359.

ὅσα τοιοῦτοτρόπως—καὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ
προσάγω τὴν τῆς λατρείας προσκύ-
νησιν—ἀλλὰ προσκυνῶ τὸν κτίστην—
De Imag. i. 4, p. 1236.

ὁμοίως τοῖς προειρημένοις—*Re-* HIPPO-
ful. ix. 21, p. 476. LYTUS.

ὁμοιοτρόπως ἐπιτελούμενα—*In* GREG.
Christ. Res. i. p. 616. NYSS.

σέβω δὲ οὐκ ὡς Θεόν—*De Imag.* JOHN
i. 16, p. 1245. DAM.

§ 3. τὰ δαίγματα τῆς ἐνιδρυμένης
ἀσεβείας—*De Dec.* § 13, p. 191. PHILO.

Verum hæc satis jam erunt multa
(ut spero) ad præbendum tibi sive
δαίγμα sive γεῦμα μετὰ didascalicæ
methodi—*Dial.* p. 103. STEPHENS.

διαφερούσης οὐδὲν (§ 5 inf.)
κατὰ τὴν ἀφροσύνην τῶν παίδων τῶν
βασιλέων (*Dion. Chrys.*)—*Sched. Var.*
i. 15, p. 70. STEPHENS.

the various words. The parallel passage from Philo is continued in
Ep. ii. 3.

⁴ 'Seu potius ὡς θεόν.' (Note at foot.) It may have been intended
originally to write the passage with ἀσεβεῖν (see parallels). So Steph.
Theol. Index Vol. p. 546: 'ἀσεβέω, non minus frequens est cum præp.
εἰς vel περί. Herodot. ἀσεβέων ἐς τὴν θείαν.' On the passage in Ep.
Stephens says: 'Ante hæc εἰ δὲ τ. π. ὁ, aut aliqua desunt, quibus
contineatur redditio: aut est figura quæ vocatur ἀναπαύδορον. Sed
illud quam hoc mihi sit verisimilius. Interim et de hoc monendus
est mihi lector, videri scribendum εἰ, et addendum unum Dei epithetum,
hoc modo, καὶ εἰ θεὸν ἓνα τῶν πάντων κτίστην σέβειν, καὶ δεσπ.'—Notes,
p. 52. Cf. par. from J. D. The εἰς perhaps was intended to be a bone
of contention. The following parallel to § 2 may be noticed:—τὸν
μόνον πάντων δεσπότην—ὑμεῖς δὲ εἰς τὸν τῶν ὅλων ἀσεβεῖτε θεόν—ἐναντία
τῷ θεῷ φρονεῖν—ναοὺς τιμᾶσιν (*Orat. ad Græc.* § 4), and τὸν ἓνα θεὸν
σέβειν.—*Hom.* x. 2, p. 260.

TEXT.

λον ἡγοῦντ' αὐν, ⁵ οὐ
θεοσέβειαν.

PARALLELS.

τουγαροῦν μᾶλλον εἰκός ἐστιν— STEPHENS.
Rud. Fid. p. 185. *Ed.* 1588.

χλείης μᾶλλον, ⁶ ἡ ἀληθείας δόγ- JOHN
μα ἔχουσι—τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν πα- DAM.
ράδεισον (*Ep.* xii. 1) ἡγοῦνται—*De*
Hæres. § 52, p. 709.

μύθους γὰρ μᾶλλον καὶ μωρίας— THEO-
Autol. iii. 8, p. 376. PHILUS.

κατὰ ⁶ πρόσταξιν τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅταν PHILO.
αὐτῷ δοκῇ, μηδὲν προσδεηθέντι τῶν
κατ' οὐρανὸν ἐκγόνων, οἷς ⁷ δυνάμεις
ἔδωκεν—μηδενὸς προσδεόμενος ἄλ-
λου· ⁸ πάντα γὰρ θεῷ δυνατά—*De*
Mund. Opif. § 14, p. 10.

⁹ Quasi indigenti—*Contr. Hæres.* IRENÆUS.
iv. 17, p. 1023.

§ 4. ὁ γὰρ ποιή-
σας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ
τὴν γῆν καὶ πάντα
τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ
πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ¹⁰ χορη-
γῶν ὧν ¹⁰ προσδεό-
μεθα, οἷδενός αὐν
αὐτὸς προσδίδοιτο
τούτων ὧν τοῖς οἰο-
μένοις διδόναι παρ-
έχει αὐτός.

§ 4. ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον CLEMENS
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ· οὗτος, οὐρανοῦ ALEX.
καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχων Κύριος, οὐκ ἐν χειρο-
ποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ· οὐδὲ ὑπὸ
χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται, προσ-
δεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς ἐοὺς πᾶσι ζῶν
καὶ πνοῇ, καὶ τὰ πάντα (*Act.* xvii. 24,
25)—*Strom.* i. 19, p. 372.

πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὸν παρόντα βίον STEPHENS.
ἀναγκαῖα χορηγῶν—*Rud. Fid.* p.
344.

τούτον τὸν πλοῦτον σοφία χορηγεῖ PHILO.
—*De Fort.* § 3, p. 377. χορηγῶν—¹⁰ τὴν
ἀναγκαιοτάτην—τροφήν—*Ib.* § 2, p.
376.

τὰ πρὸς ¹⁰ τροφήν—ἀναγκαῖα, ἄλ- STEPHENS.
λὰ καὶ τίλλα ὧν ¹⁰ προσδεόμεθα—
Rud. Fid. p. 188.

⁵ 'Legens etiam ἡ pro οὐ. Posse tamen ferri οὐ non negaverim.'—
Steph. notes, p. 52. ⁶ See *Ep.* vi. 10. ⁷ See *Ep.* vii. 2.

⁸ See *Mark* x. 27. These words give a connexion with Clement's
Quis Div. Salv. Similar words are used by our Lord in the passage
on which Clement comments. It seems part of our writer's plan to bring
together all passages which appear mutually to illustrate one another.
See *Ep.* i. n. 2.

⁹ Irenæus makes a very special point of this.

¹⁰ Observe the curious way in which our Epistle, the marginal
note upon the MS., Philo and Stephens' translation of Calvin's *Rud.*
Fid. are all entangled together. The passage from Eusebius almost
immediately precedes κοινή τράπεζα, vide *Ep.* v. 7.

TEXT.

(Codex Argent. in margine præbet glossam a myribus ex parte corrosam: ¹⁰ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς . . . δεῖς ἐστ . . . οὐδ' ἐνο . . . προσφ . . . αὐτῷ . . . ὡς . . . εἰρηκ . . . γὰρ ἐκῶν . . . ῥῶν ἡμῶ . . . ἐξήτησι—*Oratio*, p. 102.)

§ 5. οἱ δὲ γε θυσίας αὐτῷ δι' αἵματος καὶ κνίσσης καὶ ὀλοκαυτωμάτων ἐπιτελεῖν οἰόμενοι, καὶ ταύταις ταῖς τιμαῖς αὐτὸν γεραίρειν, οὐδὲν μοι δοκοῦσι διαφέρειν τῶν ¹³ τὰ κωφὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδεικνυμένοις φιλοτιμίαν, ¹⁴ τῶν μὴ δυναμένων τῆς τιμῆς μεταλαμβίνειν. τὸ ¹⁵ δὲ δοκεῖν τινα παρέχειν τῷ μηδενὸς προσδεδωμένῳ.

PARALLELS.

τάλλα ὧν ¹⁰ ὁ ἀνθρώπινος βίος EUSEBIUS.
χρειώδης (*Philo.*)—*Præp. Evang.* viii.

11, p. 641.

ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τινος ¹⁰ ἀεννάου πηγῆς ἀπορρέει—πάντων ¹¹ ἀγαθῶν χορηγόν—*Rud. Fid.* p. 340. STEPHENS.

¹⁰ (ἔστι γὰρ ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἀνεπιδεῖς, οὐδενὸς χρῆζων—καὶ ὥσπερ ¹⁰ ἀπ' ἀεννάου πηγῆς ἐκείθεν ῥέων—*De Fort.* § 3, p. 377.) PHILO.

§ 5. ὁ τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργὸς καὶ πατὴρ οὐ δεῖται αἵματος, οὐδὲ κνίσσης, αὐτὸς ὧν—ἀνευδεῖς καὶ ἀπροσδεῖς—τί δέ μοι ὀλοκαυτώσεων, ὧν μὴ δεῖται ὁ Θεός; καὶ τοι προσφέρειν δεόν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, καὶ τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν—*Leg. pro Christ.* § 13, p. 308. ATHENAGORAS.

ἦν ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ἐπιδείκνυνται, καὶ διὰ τῆς τῶν ζώων ἀποδοχῆς, ἃ καὶ θεῶν τιμαῖς γεραίρουσι—*Vit. Mos.* i. 5, p. 84. PHILO.

¹² ἐπιτελεῖν θυσίαν—*Vit. Mos.* i. 52, p. 126, and elsewhere. PHILO.

τούτους—τιμαῖς ἐγείρειν· ὥστε πολλὴν πᾶσι φιλοτιμίαν ἐνέβαλλεν—*Thes.* (quoting *Xen. Pæd.*) vol. iii. p. 1558. STEPHENS.

τὴν μεγίστην φιλοτιμίαν εἰς τοῦτο—*Strom.* i. 22, p. 410. CLEMENS ALEX.

ἐνεκα τοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸν Θεὸν ζητεῖν, ἢ θεραπεύειν, ἢ καὶ (ὅπερ οὐδὲν ¹³ διαφέρει) αὐτὴν οὕτω θεραπεύειν ὡς διὰ ταύτης τῆς θεραπείας τιμώντας τὸν Θεόν, ἢ ἄλλως πως αὐτῇ καταχρησθαι εἰς εἰδωλολατρείαν—*Rud. Fid.* p. 100. STEPHENS.

¹¹ Cf. πάντων ἀγαθῶν ταμίης καὶ χορηγός.—Euseb. *Præp. Evang.* i. 1, p. 25.

¹² Five lines below Philo writes, ὡς χρόνῳ καθάπερ γραφὴν ἐξήτηλον γενομένην. Stephens gives this passage in his *Thesaurus*, Index Vol. p. 894. *Vit. Ep.* iv. 6, n. 13. The preceding parallel from Philo would seem to have been in Constantine's mind in *Orat. ad Sanct. Coet.* c. 4, p. 1241.—Eusebius.

¹³ See § 3 sup. par. Dion Chrys. Cf. *Gal.* ii. 6.

TEXT.

PARALLELS.

τὰ εἰδωλα—οὐτε ὠφελῆσαι ¹⁴δυνά-
μενα—On I Cor. viii. 1, p. 628.

JOHN
DAM.

οὐχὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀλλὰ διαφερούσης
ιδέας, ὧν τὸ μὲν περὶ κλήρου διαδοχῆς,
¹⁵τὸ δὲ ὅσα τῷ δοκεῖν παρὰ καιρὸν
ἐπιτελουμένης ἱερουργίας—Vit. Mos.
iii. 29, p. 168. ¹⁵ὅσα γε τῷ δοκεῖν—
Ib. i. 10, p. 89.

PHILO.

ὑπολαμβάνοντες τῶν τιμωμένων
—¹⁶ἀνελών οὖν ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς νομοθεσίας
πᾶσαν τὴν τοιαύτην ἐκθέωσιν, ἐπὶ τὴν
τοῦ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ὄντος θεοῦ τιμὴν
ἐκάλεσεν, ἐαυτοῦ τιμῆς οὐ προσδεύ-
μενος—De Decal. § 16, p. 194.

PHILO.

CHAPTER IV.

§ I. ἀλλὰ μὴν
τόγε περὶ τὰς βρώ-
σεις αὐτῶν ψοφο-
δεῖς, καὶ τὴν περὶ
τὰ σύββατα δεισι-
δαιμονίαν, καὶ τὴν
τῆς περιτομῆς ἀλα-

§ I. Vid. c. iii. I. οὐτ' οὖν σώμα-
τος, κ.τ.λ.

EUSEBIUS.

γοήτων τε γὰρ καὶ μάγων οἱ πρῶτοι
τῆς ἀνωτάτω παρ' αὐτῷ τιμῆς ἡξίωντο,
¹ψοφοδεοῦς ἐς τὰ μάλιστα καὶ δεισι-
δαιμονεστάτου καθιστώτος, τὴν τε
περὶ τὰ εἰδωλα καὶ τοὺς δαίμονας περὶ

EUSEBIUS.

¹⁴ 'Scribo τῶν εἰς τὰ κ.'—Steph. notes, p. 52. 'Pariter codex Argentin. habet, qui eis evidenter agnoscit, sed ἐνδεικνύμενοι pro ἐνδεικνυμένοις offert.'—Otto, p. 87. 'Scribendum τῶν εἰς τὰ κωφὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδεικνυμένων φιλοτιμίαν, ut et Beurerus scribit; sed is hæc verba τῶν μὴ δυναμένων non mutat in τὰ μὴ δυνάμενα: quod ego tamen faciendum puto, ut hæc referantur ad κωφά.'—Steph. notes, p. 99.

¹⁵ These words may well have suggested the reading in the text and the necessary correction. St. conjectured τῷ γε δοκεῖν.

¹⁶ A few lines above we find the words διεφθείρετο—ἐρπετῶν τὴν ἰοβόλον ἀσπίδα γεραίρουσιν ἱεροῖς καὶ τεμένεσι. Cf. ἐρπετὸν ἰοβόλον ἀνελών—Orat. ad Græc. § 3, p. 3, and see Ep. c. ii. 2, n. 9.

¹ Suggested by δεισιδαιμονίας καὶ πλάνης.—Euseb. H. E. i. 4, p. 79. See preceding parallel. In the course of our inquiry our attention was called to the following passage: τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς δεισιδαιμόνως καὶ ψοφοδέως ἔχω.—Luc. Pro Imag. § 7, p. 488. The two words are brought almost as nearly together § 27, p. 506. The γοήτων—πλάνην which finds its place in Ep. c. viii. 4, seems to fix the reference to Eusebius. Still it is more than possible that this passage from Lucian was in our writer's mind. He certainly seems to make some use of Lucian (vid. c. vii. 2). In the parallel from Clem. Alex. in this section, we observe the words τὰ ἔξωθεν. Clement is speaking of heathen literature. Stephens, giving a caution on this subject in his preface to Rud. Fid., speaks, p. 6, of the τὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν συγγραφέων διδάγματα. Vid. Ep. v. 3.

TEXT.

ζονείαν, καὶ τὴν τῆς
νηστείας καὶ νουμηνίας
εἰρωνείαν, κατα-
γέλαστα καὶ οὐδὲν
ἄξια λόγου, νομίζω
σε χρήζειν παρ' ἐμοῦ
μαθεῖν.

§ 2. τό τε γὰρ τῶν
ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κτισ-
θέντων εἰς χρήσιν
ἀνθρώπων, ἃ μὲν ὡς
καλῶς κτισθέντα
παραδέχασθαι, ἃ δ'
ὡς ἄχρηστα καὶ
περισσά, παραιτίσ-
θαι, πῶς ὁ οὐ θέμις
ἐστι;

PARALLELS.

πολλοῦ τιθεμένου πλάνην—*H. E.* viii.
14, p. 784.

Vid. Contr. Hæres. iv. cc. 16, 17.

'Ulpianus Demosthenis enarrator
ἀλαζονείαν ait esse hominum plura
quam præstare possint pollicentium;
atque huic contrariam esse εἰρωνείαν,
quæ dissimulat ea se præstare posse quæ
potest. Quam Ulpiani annotationem eo
lubentius recipio quod repererim apud
Plutarchum² (si bene memini) itidem ἀλα-
ζῶν et εἰρων inter se opposita—*Theo.*
vol. i. p. 307.

³ μικρὰ καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄξια λόγου—
Orat. xlii. p. 470.

τὰ ἡμέτερα ἔργα καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄξια
λογίζεται—*Rud. Fid.* p. 80.

ἄμαθῶς ψοφοδεῶν· τὰ δὲ ἔξωθεν
καὶ περιττὰ ὑπερβαίνειν—*Strom.* i. 1,
p. 326.

⁴ ὥστε μαθεῖν παρ' ἐμοῖ ταῦτα τὰ
γρᾶμματικά—*Dial. de Bene Instit.* p.
74.

§ 2. μὴ βουλόμενοι χρήσθαι τοῖς
ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κτισθεῖσιν, ἀλλ' οὐτοί γε,
ἀσεβεῖ θεομαχία—*Strom.* iii. 3, p.
515.

καὶ κωλύνοντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι
βρωμάτων, ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκτίσει εἰς μετά-
ληψιν—ὅτι πᾶν κτίσμα Θεοῦ καλὸν
καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπόβλητον (1 *Tim.* iv. 3, 4)
—*Strom.* iii. 12, p. 550.

εἰ ἀντίταξιν τὴν πρὸς τὸν δημιουργοῦ—

² *Plut. Sympos.* i. 446, ed. Reiske.

³ 'Vel οὐδενὸς vel οὐδὲ scribendum puto: deinde addendam particulam οὐ ante νομίζω.'—Notes, p. 53. 'Vocabulum οὐδενὸς pro οὐδὲν, quod in editis invenitur, ex codice Argent. reposui.'—Otto, p. 87. *Vid.* § 2, n. 4. With the parallel from *Rud. Fid.* cf. πῶς—ἅπαντα πεπράχθαι; καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄξια εἶναι τὰ ἡμέτερα—*Adv. Jud.* i. p. 392. Chrys. *Vid. Ep.* ii. 7 par. to ἀφυλάκτους. Notice ὑμᾶς τε νομίζω—μὴ ποθεῖν.—Bas. *de Leg. Libr. Gent.* § 1, p. 564. μὴ is wanting in some MSS. This treatise seems to have been used in our Epistle, as also in the *Oratio ad Græcos*. Stephens' preface to *Rud. Fid.* is greatly indebted to it.

⁴ This line appears for some reason to have been fixed in Stephens' mind. He quotes it twice in this treatise from memory, as he says.

IRENÆUS.
STEPHENS.

GREG.
NAZ.

STEPHENS.

STEPHENS.

STEPHENS.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

CLEMENS
ALEX.

TEXT.

PARALLELS.

- γόν, τὴν χρῆσιν τῶν κοσμικῶν παραι-
τουμένον—*Strom.* iii. 4, p. 522.
- τῶν εἰς χρῆσιν δοθέντων ἀνθρώ-
ποις ὑπὸ θεοῦ—*De Decal.* § 16, p.
194.
- τὴν πολλὴν δὲ ἀχρηστίαν παραι-
τητέον—⁵ *Strom.* vi. 10, p. 781.
- ⁶ πῶς θέμις ἡμῖν ἔσται;—*Rud.*
Fid. p. 155.
- § 3. τὸ δὲ κατα-
ψεύδεται θεοῦ, ὡς
κωλύοντος ἐν τῇ τῶν
σαββάτων ἡμέρᾳ
καλὸν τι ποιεῖν, πῶς
οὐκ ἀσεβεῖς;
- § 3. τοῦ Θεοῦ—καταψευσάμενοι
(*Philo.*)—*Præf. Evang.* viii. 13, p.
652.
- καταψεύδεται τοῦ πέλας—*Rud.*
Fid. p. 136.
- Ἰουδαίους, κωλύσαι θέλοντας διὰ
τὸ σάββατον καὶ λέγοντας, οὐκ ἔξε-
στι σοι ἄραι τὸν κράββατον, ὅτι σάβ-
βατον ἔστιν—*In Paralyt.* p. 129.
- πῶς οὐκ ἀσεβεῖς—*Protrept.* 8, p.
68.
- πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἀσεβεῖτε—*Strom.* iii.
4, p. 528.
- λέγοντες, εἰ ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασιν
θεραπεύειν;—ὥστε ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασιν
καλῶς ποιεῖν—*Matt.* xii. 10, 12.
- § 4. τὸ δὲ καὶ τὴν
μείωσιν τῆς σαρκὸς
μαρτύριον⁸ ἐκλογῆς
ἀλαζονεύεσθαι, ὡς
- § 4. τοῦτο ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ, τοῦτο
ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ, τοῦτο ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδω-
δύμων παρατηρήσει—ὥσπερ τοίνυν διὰ
τῆς ἱεροτομῆς τὴν πνευματικῶς ἐπι-

⁵ On this chapter see Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5, p. 760.

⁶ 'Vel tolle οὐ, vel lege πῶς οὐκ ἀθέμιτόν ἐστι;—Steph. notes, p. 53.
Vid. § 1, n. 2. It would thus appear that Stephens thought that οὐ
had in the one case been carelessly taken into the text, and in the other
dropped out. In his *Sched. Var.* he discusses various passages from
Clem. Alex. and amongst others *Strom.* vii. 6, p. 849. ὁ Ἐσσωπος οὐ
καλῶς ἔφη. 'Quum scribendum sit καλῶς, aut certe οὐ κακῶς.'—Lib. v.
20, p. 227. And in lib. vi. 6, p. 309, he mentions some of the vicissitudes
to which this negative is exposed. For an instance of 'superflua
negatio' see John Dam. *De Imag.* iii. 21. p. 1341, οὐ μόνον αἰτίαν.
Use is made in Ep. c. xii. 8 apparently of the sentence following that
in which these words occur. A few lines further down still we find
the expression πηγῆς ἀναβλυζούσης. We have the same idea in Hom.
in Dorm. B. V. Mar. ii. p. 731: πηγὴ καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπάρχει
ἀνάβλυσις; and p. 746, πηγὴν ἀένανον ἐπλούτησα τὴν ἀνάβλυσιν. Cf.
ἀ ἐκ τῆς ἀένανου πηγῆς τῆς ἐλευθεριότητος αὐτοῦ ἀναβλύζει ἀγαθὰ.—*Rud.*
Fid. 156. It is curious to observe how Stephens combines these
passages in his own sentence.

⁷ Stephens, in his notes, p. 53, says: 'Sed et duæ sunt περιτομαί,

TEXT.

διὰ τοῦτο ἑξαιρέτως
ἡγαπημένους ὑπὸ
θεοῦ, πῶς οὐ ¹⁰ χλε-
ύης ἄξιον;

PARALLELS.

τελουμένης—διὰ δὲ τοῦ σαββατισμοῦ,
τὴν ἐν τῷ κακῷ ἀπραξίαν διδάσκεται
—ἡ ἐορτὴ σοι αὕτη τὴν ἐορτὴν ἐκείνην
ἐνδείκνυται, πρὸς ἣν ἡ ψυχὴ διὰ τῶν
ἀζύμων παρασκευάζεται (cf. *Ep.* vi. 9)
—ἐκ νεομηνίας ἡ σελήνη δι' αὐξήσεως
—πάλιν διὰ μειώσεως—*In Chr. Res.*
Orat. i. p. 620.

ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ δόξα—οὐδὲ αὐξησιν οὐδὲ
μείωσιν—*Rud. Fid.* p. 183. STEPHENS.

ἡ περιτομὴ οὐ χρεῖωδες μέλος ἀπο-
τέμνει τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ περίττωμα
ἄχρηστον—*De Fid. Orth.* iv. 25, p.
1213. JOHN DAM.

⁸ μαρτυρίας τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ καθόλου
ἐκλογῆς—*Cont. Hær.* iv. 37, p. 1100. IRENÆUS.

εὐνοίας μαρτύριον παρέχεται—
Rud. Fid. p. 12 (and elsewhere). STEPHENS.

⁹ ἵνα ὁ βαπτισμὸς μαρτύριον αὐ-
τοῖς παρέχῃ—*Rud. Fid.* p. 239. STEPHENS.

τοῦτό γε καὶ ¹⁰ χλεύης ἄξιον—*De*
Vit. Cont. § 1, p. 472. PHILO.

quarum unam alteri opponit.' We may observe that our writer takes up the points suggested by S. Gregory.

⁸ The expression *μαρτ. ἐκλ.* was certainly taken from Iren. The chapter in which it occurs, which in the Latin is of considerable length, contains in the Greek only four fragments, three of which are exceedingly short. Of these the first and third are noticeably represented in *Ep.* c. vii. 4. An expression in the fourth is found in *Ep.* c. xii. 1. The second contains the expression before us. We must observe that *μαρτυρίαν* is by our writer changed to *μαρτύριον*. *Ep.* c. 1, supplies us with two examples of changes of like character. 'In exemplo tantum *μαρτυρ* (*sic*) apparet; sed *μαρτύριον* (et quidem potius quam *μαρτυρίαν*) scriptum fuisse reor.'—Steph. notes, p. 53. 'Hæc correctio (*propter affinitatem generis*—Otto) confirmatur apographo Beur.' (Sylburg) 'et codice Argent.; in eo perspicue scripta sunt duo (*μαρτύριον, χλεύης*; see note ¹⁰) ista vocabula'—Otto, p. 88. On the assumption that the *Ep.* is a genuine document, in which the three final letters only of *μαρτύριον* are wanting, how comes it to pass that *μαρτυρ* is without an accent?

⁹ The Catechism has just previously discussed the question of circumcision.

¹⁰ 'In exemplo non *χλεύης*, sed duæ tantum primæ literæ *χλ* apparent; verum non dubitavi *χλεύης* scribere; quum et loco huic quadret, et sæpe verbo *χλευάζειν* utatur. Scio autem et *χλευασμοῦ* potuisse dici, sed spatium breviori tantum vocabulo relictum erat.'—Steph. notes, p. 53. This conjecture is confirmed by the cod. Argent. as well as by the parallels.

TEXT.

§ 5. τὸ δὲ παρεδρεύοντας αὐτοὺς ἀστροῖς καὶ σελήνῃ παρατήρησιν τῶν μ.¹¹ καὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν ποιῆσθαι, καὶ τὰς οἰκονομίας θεοῦ καὶ τὰς τῶν καιρῶν ἀλλαγὰς ¹² κατὰ * πρὸς τὰς αὐτῶν ὁρμάς, ἃς μὲν, εἰς ἑορτὰς, ἃς δὲ, εἰς πένθη· τίς ἂν θεοσεβείας καὶ οὐκ ἀφροσύνης πολὺ πλέον ῥηγήσεται τὸ δέγμα;

PARALLELS.

καὶ χλεῦνης καὶ γέλωτος ἄξια—BASIL.
ἐξαίρετως—*Reg. Brev. Tract.* p. 1261.

§ 5. οἷτινες—πᾶσάν τε τὴν ἀστρονομίαν καὶ ἀστρολογίαν παραδεχόμενοι—καὶ ἑορτὰς τινας Ἑλληνικὰς τιμῶντες, ἡμέρας τε αὐθις, καὶ ¹¹ μῆνας, καὶ καιροὺς, καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς παρατηροῦμενοι—*De Hæres.* § 94, p. 757.

¹² ἡ πάρεδρος τῷ θεῷ—καιρῶν PHILO.
καταλλαγῇ—*Vit. Mos.* ii. 10, p. 142; ii. p. 143. εἰρωνείαν—i. 49, p. 123. τὰς αὐτῶν ὁρμάς—i. 28, p. 106. ἑορτῇ, πένθος—iii. 29, p. 169.

τῷ πατρὶ παρεδρεύει—*Rud. Fid.* STEPHENS.
p. 59. τὴν ἐκείνων ὁρμήν—*Ib.* p. 27.

καιρῶν ἀλλαγῇ—*Autol.* i. 6, p. 364. THEOPHILUS

παρεδρεύουσιν οὗτοι τοῖς λεγομένοις Μητρὸς μεγάλης μυστηρίοις—*Refut.* v. 9, p. 170. HIPPOLYTUS.

ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ἔφοδος, καθ' ἣν εἰς τοσαύτας μοίρας τὸν ζωδιακὸν ¹³ καταδιαιροῦσι κύκλον, ἐστὶ τοιαύτη· ἀνάλογος δ' ὅμοιον εἶναι, καὶ καθ' ἣν τὸν ἐφ' ἐκάστης γενέσεως ὠροσκόπον ἀρχικῶς παρατετηρηκῆναι λέγουσι. νύκτωρ μὲν γὰρ ὁ Χαλδαῖός, φησιν, ἐφ' ὑψηλῆς τινὸς ἀκρωρείας ἐκαθέζετο ἀστεροσκοπῶν.

¹¹ 'Ubi habes solam literam μ, scriptum fuisse μηνῶν arbitror.'—Steph. notes, p. 53. '—Id quod Argent. bene firmat'—Otto. p. 88.

¹² Suggesting the παρεδρεύειν of the text.

¹³ 'Ex kata faciendum puto καταρρυθμίζειν.' 'Cæterum pro kata (Beurerus) non reponit καταρρυθμίζειν, ut reponendum mihi videri in annot. dixi, sed καταδιαίρειν.'—Steph. notes, pp. 54, 100. 'Beur. apogr. καταδιαίρειν, duplici manu (primum enim kata scriptum erat, post alia manu additum διαίρειν). St. καταρρυθμίζειν. posset etiam κατανέμειν aut κατατάττειν.'—Sylburg. 'Eamdemque lectionem (καταδιαίρειν) codex Argent. indicavit, quippe qui prima manu κατὰ . . . εἰν offerat: reliquæ literæ aliquantulum evanuerunt'—Otto. p. 88. παρεδρεύειν is used also by Sextus twice on p. 120, and καταδιαίρειν occurs several times. Lucian writes ὄντο νεκρῷ παρεδρεύοντες, τὰ μὲν σκεῖη πάντα, ὅσα ἐκόμψεν ἐκεῖνος, διανέμονται ἐμοὶ τε, καὶ τῷ ἱππῳ. *Luc. sive As.* § 19, p. 587. Cf. Sylburg's conjecture. Was there a touch of satire in our writer's application of the word? We know his habit of combining passages.

TEXT.

(Codex. Argent. in marg. hanc præbet notam. ὅτι παρήδρενον Ἑβραῖοι ἄστροις καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ τὰς παρατηρήσεις αὐτῶν ἐφύλα(σσαν)—Otto. p. 103.)

§ 6. τῆς μὲν οὖν κοινῆς εἰκασιότητος καὶ ἀπάτης, καὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίων πολυπραγμοσύνης καὶ ἀλαζονείας ¹⁶ ὁρθῶς ἀπέχονται Χριστιανοί, ἀρκούντως σε νομίζω μεμαθηκέναι· τὸ δὲ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν θεοσεβείας μυστήριον μὴ προσδοκήσης δύνασθαι παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μαθεῖν.

PARALLELS.

ἕτερος δὲ παρήδρενε τῇ ὠδινούσῃ μέχρῃς ἀποτέξαιτο—*Adv. Math. v. Adv. Astrol. p. 114. Coloniae, 1621.*

τὰ δείγματα τῆς ἐνιδρυμένης ἀσεβείας—*De Dec. § 13, p. 191.* PHILO.

¹⁴ (κατὰ τὸν Ἑβραίων προπάτορα Ἀβραάμ—τὰ περὶ ἀστρολογίαν παραδιδώσι (*Josephus, Antig. ii. 8. p. 23*)—*Præp. Evang. ix. 16, p. 705*.) EUSEBIUS.

§ 6. ἐξ οὗ μοι δοκεῖς εἰκασιότητα καὶ εὐχέριαν ἀπελέγχειν σεαυτοῦ μᾶλλον, ἢ πρὸς τὸ μαθεῖν ἐτοιμότητα ¹⁵ μηνύειν—*Quod. Det. Pot. § 4, p. 193.* PHILO.

οἱ ὁρθῶς φιλοσοφούντες ἀπέχονται—ἐνδεικνυμένη ὅτι ¹⁶ ἀπάτης—*Phæd. pp. 82, 83.* PLATO.

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἀρκούντως λέλχθω—*Quod. Det. Pot. § 39, p. 218.* PHILO.

τῆς κοινῆς ἀμαρτίας—*In Chr. Res. Orat. i. p. 612.* GREG. NYSS.

τὸ μέγα τῆς θεοσεβείας μυστήριον—*H. E. iii. 26, p. 272.* EUSEBIUS.

ἵνα δὴ καὶ σὺ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου μάθῃς—*Protrept. i. p. 8.* CLEMENS ALEX.

(To be continued.)

We must now say a few words upon the parallels to these first four chapters which we have brought forward. In cases of circumstantial evidence a great number of trifling coincidences are sometimes of more weight than a few of seemingly more magnitude, but which might possibly be capable of explanation. On this principle we have placed among our parallels many things which will seem on first inspection of very small moment, and on which, if they stood alone, or

¹⁴ Between these passages lies an expression found in Ep. c. ii. 1.

¹⁵ In § 21, p. 206, of this treatise Philo writes, μία σφραγίς—πάντων ἔστιν ὅτε τῶν τύπων ἐξιτήλων αὐταῖς οὐσίαις γινόμενων—ἔμεινεν. Stephens constantly, in his notes on Diognetus, uses the word ἐξιτήλος when speaking of the faded letters of the ancient MS. *Vid. Ep. iii. 5, n. 12.*

¹⁶ In some MSS. ὅτι is wanting. 'Inter ἀλαζονείας et ὁρθῶς insero voculam ὅτι.'—Steph. notes, p. 54. 'Cuncti post Sylburgium editores textui inseruere.'—Otto. p. 88. For an example of this omission in a passage used in our Epistle see c. v. 14.

anything like alone, it would be absurd to lay any stress. These, however, gather more and more force as the true character of the Epistle is perceived, and the frequency with which the same treatise (and often the same page of that treatise) is referred to. It must be further noticed, that in a good many cases, several parallels, having no special connexion the one with the other beyond the leading thought, are tied together in the Epistle by the use of words. Ep. ii. 5, gives a good illustration of this. There we have four parallels, which seem all but independent the one of the other, except in the one thought, but to each of which our Epistle seems to be specially connected. This seems entirely to set aside the idea of accidental coincidence.

In our prefatory note we pointed out that Stephens seemed to have some special knowledge of the relation of a certain writing to the *Oratio ad Græcos*. We observe the same thing in connexion with our Epistle. The quotation from Hippolytus at the close of c. i is certainly an apt parallel to the text. It verifies, however, Stephens' conjectural emendation. In chapter 2, n. 15, we see that Stephens suggested that the acts of Dionysius and Æsculapius were probably in our writer's mind. Our parallels show that those personages are alluded to in pages at which we have reason for supposing that our writer was looking, while from n. 18 we learn that those pages had been specially under Stephens' own eyes. More of these might be noticed, and more still will be given as we proceed with the inquiry. Then we find again and again coincidences of language between Stephens' books and the text or with passages which we have brought forward as parallels. (We take this opportunity of saying that by far the greater number of these parallels were placed before any of Stephens' books came into our hands, except his *Thesaurus*.) We may observe further that on several occasions the conjectures of Stephens as to supplying the gaps in his MS. are confirmed by the Cod. Argent. In c. 4. 4 (see n. 8),¹ e. g. the last three letters of μαρτύριον and the last four of χλεύης were wanting in Stephens' MS., and he conjectured μαρτύριον rather than μαρτυρίαν, and χλεύης rather than χλευασμοῦ. Both these words were plainly to be read in the Cod. Argent. In the same chapter § 5, of the word καταδιαίρειν Stephens could

¹ See c. ii. 10, and a second example out of c. iv. 5. Other instances might be given out of the Epistle, and a very noteworthy one out of the *Oratio ad Græcos*, c. iii., where Stephens' conjectural βριαρόν is confirmed by Cod. Argent.

read only *κατα*. The Cod. Argent. has *καταδ* *** *εἰν*.¹ We must surely infer that Stephens' MS. could not possibly have been the Cod. Argent. Further consideration, however, shows that they could not possibly be different. For is it credible that out of *two* MSS. the word *καταδιαίρειν* would fail and in the same part of the word? Nor does this case stand alone. In c. x. i, we find that from both MSS. the same word was wanting, except the single letter *α*. These gaps, it must be remembered, were not the transcriber's failures to decipher the same ancient document, but gaps naturally produced, the work of time, or ill-usage. We could readily produce other instances. These surely suffice to put it beyond a doubt that the Cod. Argent. was the very MS. which Stephens used. But if that be so, was Stephens (an adept, be it remembered, in deciphering MSS.), honest in making what he calls conjectures, when the very words which he conjectured were staring him in the face? Was it honest to conjecture ² *καταρρυθμίζειν* when he had *καταδ* *** *εἰν* in the MS. before him? Putting all these things together, the conclusion is forced upon us that Stephens' notes upon the Epistle were not honest, but that he knew something more about the Epistle than he cared to tell. The references which we have given to Stephens' translation of Calvin's *Catechism* seem to indicate that he had some knowledge of the Epistle in 1563. He says, however, in his preface to the 'editio princeps' (1592) that the MS. had come into his hands only six years previously. In 1563 Stephens was busily engaged in making notes for his *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguae* published in 1572.

Since the name of Henry Stephens appears so often in this article, it may be well at this point to give some account of this learned but singular man.³ He was born at Paris in 1528, and was son of Robert Stephens, hardly less celebrated than his son as a scholar and printer. From his earliest years Henry was devoted to the study of Greek, with which, rather than Latin, by his own wish, he began his student's life. The best scholars of the day were his instructors. Though Greek was Henry's great delight, he seems to have applied himself to the study of almost everything that came in his

¹ See also c. iv. 5 n. 11.

² Cf. ὁρῶμεν τὰ στοιχεῖα, καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς—ἡλίου τε καὶ ἀστέρων κινήσεις, καὶ ὁμβροὺς, καὶ τὰ τῆς γῆς ἐκφόρια, κατὰ λόγον καὶ καθ' εἰρμὸν τεταγμένα, καὶ ῥυθμιζόμενα.—J. D. *Dial. contr. Man.* § 31, p. 1536. Sylburg conjectured *κατατάττειν*. Stephens was fond of compounds of *ῥυθμίζειν*.

³ The following have been consulted and used:—Hallam, *Lit. of Europe*; Maittaire, *Vit. Steph.*; Greswell, *Hist. Early Paris. Press* Didot, *Nouvelle Biogr. Universelle*; and Stephens' books.

way. It was, as he tells us himself, in his edition of *Aulus Gellius*, quite in his youth that he investigated the mysteries of astrology: 'the extortionate demands, however, of the charlatan who instructed him and his own good sense together enabled him to shake off the infatuation. He devoted his attention also to Greek calligraphy, being the imitator of, and, as some say, the pupil of Angelos Vergetius,² 'the King's writer in Greek,' in which he became exceedingly expert. In the times of which we are speaking, though, through the revived state of learning, libraries were far more numerous and extensive than they had been a century previously, still very many MSS. were scattered about in monasteries and in private hands. The scholars of the day seem to have had each his own collection of MSS., which they borrowed the one from the other pretty freely.³ It should be remembered also that the capture of Buda by the Turks in 1527 had dispersed abroad such of the contents of the magnificent library formed by M. Corvinus as had escaped destruction. The library contained not only ancient MSS. of great value, but also an immense number of fifteenth and sixteenth century transcripts of early writings.⁴ These last were valuable to the scholar, by making him acquainted with ancient authors, but of little value to the editor and publisher without the originals from which they were copied, or some other ancient exemplars in their room.

It will be no matter for surprise that H. Stephens, at an early age, became ambitious of possessing such of these relics of antiquity as he could lay his hands upon. They were, in some sort, a passport into that literary circle into which he wished to penetrate. They were, moreover, the material which was to supply the printing-press which he proposed to establish at Paris. Accordingly, in 1547, we find that he started on a literary exploring expedition; and he spent three years and a half in making the acquaintance of the scholars, and in visiting the libraries of Rome, Florence, Naples, and

¹ Vid. *Ep.* iv. 5, note. Perhaps at this time he first became acquainted with Sextus Empir.: Stephens in his books often refers to, and sometimes quotes his writings, though they were not published in Greek until after his day.

² A MS. (*Cod. Par. Reg.* 1227) of Photius' *Biblioth.* is supposed to be in his handwriting.—*Phot.* vol. iii. p. 42, Migne.

³ Vid. e.g. P. Nannius' Pref. *Athan. Oper.*

⁴ M. Corvinus 'availed himself of the dispersion of the libraries after the capture of Constantinople to purchase Greek MSS., and employed four transcribers at Florence, besides thirty at Buda, to enrich his collection.'—Hall. *Lit. Eur.* i. p. 153; vid. Pattison. *Is. Casaub.* p. 38, Lond.: 1875.

other cities. In his Preface to the *Ep. ad Diognet.* Stephens speaks of the difficulties he found, when in Italy, in deciphering some of the ancient manuscripts. These expeditions were repeated at various times, and he not only became well acquainted with manuscripts of all dates, but also became possessed of a considerable number. Some of these he published in due course; others he used in preparing his editions of ancient authors. It is much to be regretted that Stephens was as careless, apparently, in the preservation of these valuable documents, as he was careful and diligent in the finding and acquiring them.

Returning to Paris at the close of 1551, he set up his printing-press in that city. That same year he put forth his first printed production—the first in a stream which was poured forth from one press or another so plentifully that, Hallam says, 'in the year 1557 alone he published more editions of ancient authors than would have sufficed to make the reputation of another scholar'—(*Lit. Eur.* i. p. 988.)

In 1554 appeared the 'editio princeps' of the *Odes of Anacreon*, beautifully printed, and for the preparation of which Stephens collated two manuscripts which had come into his possession, adding one Ode, which he professed to have found on the cover of an old writing. 'This book,' Greswell says,—

'was variously received. The majority of the learned considered it a happy discovery; but some mistrusted it. Robertellus would not acknowledge it as legitimate; Fulvius Ursinus, in his edition of *Greek Lyric Poets*, denied a place to Anacreon. It were to be wished that the two manuscripts of which we have spoken had been preserved, but unfortunately H. Est., at the end of his days, having fallen into a sort of aberration of intellect,¹ suffered them to perish, with many others, which he communicated to no one—not even to his son-in-law, Casaubon'—(vol. ii. p. 155.)

In 1557 Stephens published an edition of Athenagoras (*Apol. and Resurr.*), manuscripts of which, as he told P. Nannius in

¹ For the greater part of his life Stephens was subject to a certain mental malady, the like to which, he says, he had never heard or read of. While it was upon him he loathed his ordinary employment, and could not enter his library without putting his hand before his eyes. During one of these attacks he devoted himself to calligraphy, some specimens of which he afterwards engraved. On another occasion he completed a translation of the *Hypotoposes* of Sextus, which he had some while before thrown aside on account of its difficulty—(Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* Pref. H. Steph. 1562. Gresw. ii. pp. 201, 206.)

1551, had come into his hands. In 1563 he put forth *Rudimenta Fidei Christianæ: addita est ecclesiasticarum precum formula*. Gr. Lat. 12mo.¹ 'This' (Greswell, p. 208) 'is Calvin's *Catechism*, elegantly translated by Henry himself into Greek.' The volume we spoke of above, as published in 1551, was the first edition of this *Catechism*, which was originally written in French. While turning it into Latin, Calvin made some alterations. Stephens took advantage of the opportunity which a fresh edition of this translation afforded to make some emendations.

He tells us, in a note at the end of the book, that Melancthon had, of his own accord, sent him a letter of high approval of his earlier work (1551). Melancthon, we may observe, was cousin and pupil of the eminent Johann Reuchlin, whose name appeared upon the back of the Strasburg MS. of the *Ep. to Diognet.*, and who died in 1522. The title-page of this little book bears upon it the words 'Excudebat H. Steph. illustris viri Huldrici Fuggeri typogr.'² Under this patronage Stephens' opportunities for the study of ancient MSS. were no doubt largely increased.

In 1572 Stephens published his great work the *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguae*. His father, it would seem, had collected some materials for this work, and Sylburg, the great German scholar, assisted him, but Henry himself spent twelve years in its compilation. The value of the *Thesaurus* to Greek scholarship is too well-known to need remark here. We may observe, however, that it was not prepared for the press exactly in the manner which we should have supposed. Stephens tells us in his Preface,³ that it was written out for the press

¹ This translation is throughout largely indebted to the Greek Fathers and the Liturgies, and indeed to Greek literature generally. Thus the writer contrives (on p. 127), by the alteration of a participle into an infinitive, to incorporate a line by Agathon. This is very specially the case with the preface to the work, in which Stephens transcribes a passage from *Xen. Mem.* (ii. 1. 21), but without any acknowledgment. The thoughts and words of this preface can in nearly all cases be distinctly traced to sources more or less ancient. Some examples have been already given and more will follow. The Greek title *στοιχειώσις τῆς πίστεως* seems taken from Athan. *De Incarn. Verb.* p. 109, colon. 1686.

² Stephens assumed this appellation in 1558. Fugger, a native of Augsburg and born in 1528, 'expended extraordinary sums in the purchase of good MSS. of ancient authors, and in procuring impressions of them'—Gresw. ii. p. 170.

³ 'Falleris enim, lector, si hoc opus (exceptis paucis quibusdam ejus locis) aliter quam ad clepsydram (ut loqui soleo) typographicam scriptum fuisse putas; id est, ut quemadmodum typographicæ operæ certo quotidie penso obnoxia sunt, ita et ipse certo certaue hora exhibendo

under great difficulties, as the printers wanted material. We shall marvel at the prodigious powers of mind and memory which could produce such a work under such circumstances; but we shall not be surprised to find that he omits many words and many references that we might fairly expect, nor that he proposed to issue one day a supplementary volume to supply such deficiencies as he might observe, and for which it would appear that he collected some materials. We shall not wonder that in very many cases he does not give chapter and verse for the references which he makes, nor that the wording of the quotations is oftentimes inaccurate, so much so as to draw down upon him the charge of falsifying the authors to whom he appealed.

In 1577 he produced a small volume¹ containing some letters of SS. Gregory, Basil, and other writers, some dialogues of Lucian, some poems (first published in his edition of Anacreon), and a Satire which he describes as by 'an uncertain author,' and which was from the pen of the Chancellor de l'Hospital. We do not say that Stephens intended to pass this off as the work of an old Latin poet; if he did it would be no matter for surprise, for Greswell says that 'the *factum pro antiquo* was an exercise commonly practised by early scholars; and often with so much ingenuity as to deceive the best critics'—(p. 316.) Stephens may have thought that the poem bore very sufficient indications of modern authorship. As a fact, however, it did deceive no less a scholar than Barthius (Gresw. ii. p. 333). In 1578 appeared '*Schediasmatum variorum*, id est, Observationum, Emendationum, Expositionum, Disquisitionum libri tres, quæ sunt Pensa succisivarum horarum Januarii, Februarii, Martii.' April, May, and June followed some years later. So fond was Stephens of speaking of these productions that they became a sort of byword among men, like Leunclavius² and others,

scriptionis meæ penso obnoxius essem. Adde quod ne id quidem conficiendi pensi tempus, licet breve, liberum ab aliis occupationibus et negotiis erat, sed ita vario eorum genere et circa rem typographicam et circa rem familiarem districtum atque implicitum, ut unius interdu horæ spatio decies illa mihi scriptio intermittenda esset.'—(*Thes. Pref. p. 17.*)

¹ *Epistolia, Dialogi Breves, Oratiunculæ, Poëmata, ex variis utriusque linguae scriptoribus. Inter poëmata autem est Satyra elegantissima, quæ inscribitur Lis, non prius edita,* 1577.

² Leunclavius had been severely handled by Stephens, and he retorts in his notes to his edition of Xenophon with great acrimony. While the work was in preparation, Leunclavius died, and Sylburg became the actual publisher. He added a commendatory preface. This is noteworthy, as it would seem to show that a breach had taken place between

with whom Stephens was no favourite. They are, however, remarkable productions, not clearly the hasty effusions which the title might lead us to suppose. They show the hold which Stephens has obtained over ancient literature, both Greek and Latin, and his power of producing from all sources passages which answered the purpose which he had in hand. In 1592 appeared the *Epistola ad Diognetum* and the *Oratio ad Græcos*. His career as an author was closed by the publication of a poem which bore upon the title-page 'Argentorati, Bertramus, 1596.' He died two years afterwards in poverty in the hospital at Lyons.¹

As to the great attainments and literary ability of Stephens, no difference of opinion can be said to exist. On the discretion and even honesty with which he used his great powers, the opinions of persons capable of judging seem to differ widely. Some speak of his labours, of his emendations of the texts he edited, of the skill with which he detected the various errors of transcribers of ancient MSS., in terms of the highest commendation. Others seem hardly able to find words of sufficient bitterness in which to express their adverse opinion. Let it suffice to quote the words—words both of praise and blame—of the writer of the article on Plato in Smith's *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog.* (p. 404, ed. 1849): 'The edition of H. Stephanus is equally remarkable for the careful preparation of the text, by correcting mistakes of copyists and typographers, and introducing in several instances very felicitous improvements, and for the dishonesty with which the editor appropriated to himself the labours of others without any acknowledgment, and with various tricks strove to hide the source from which they were derived.' There is no reason why any difference of opinion should exist. His own writings, if properly examined, must necessarily give a decisive yea, or an equally decisive nay, to the charges which have been brought against him.

When we turn, however, to consider H. Stephens from other points of view than that of mere scholarship, we find little sure ground on which to tread. His books are indeed to some extent our guide. He was a Protestant, and, as his *Thesaurus*, his translation of Calvin's *Catechism*, and other of

himself and Stephens, of whom he speaks very kindly in his edition of Justin, in 1593.

¹ Stephens lost the fortune which he inherited from his father, partly through his restless roving habits, partly through the expense of printing his *Thesaurus*, of the profits of which he was deprived by the publication of Scapula's abridgment.

his writings abundantly show, thoroughly conversant with all Christian literature to which he could find access. He never entered, however, the arena of polemical controversy properly so called. He was an unsparing denouncer of the vice and superstition of the age, and specially in all high places, as his *L'Apologie pour Hérodote* and his *Principum Monitrix Musa*, which Didot describes as his great work, 'très hardi et très curieux,' bear witness. But then, as Greswell points out (p. 157), though his opinions were the same as those of his father, he was never persecuted on account of them. He was never accused of disguising his opinions, and yet he remained at Paris unmolested long after his father had been forced to leave it. He was never indeed promoted to the dignity of 'Typographus Regius,' still he printed under the royal licence. The truth is, we know almost nothing of Henry Stephens outside of his books. We must think of him as one who lived in troublous times, which made his path in life one of exceeding difficulty. If further we think of him as one who recoiled on the one hand from the vice and superstition of Rome, and on the other, like his son-in-law Isaac Casaubon, from the extreme views of Geneva, and at the same time as possibly without sufficient strength of religious character to take up a decided ground of his own, we think that we shall not be far astray.

We shall break off the inquiry at this point for this time. We have shown, we think, some reason for supposing that the materials out of which the Epistle was composed were gathered from sources much later in the history of the Church than is commonly supposed. We have proved, we believe, that the MS. which Stephens used was the Cod. Argent. We have concluded from this that Stephens' notes cannot be honest, but that he was guilty of some trick, or, at least, conscious of some mystery belonging to the Epistle. The fraud is hardly less in the one case than in the other. We have not found anything in his life, which would lead us summarily to dismiss the charge of dishonesty. If these first four chapters of the Epistle constituted the whole of the document, and came now into notice for the first time for examination, would they be generally accepted as a genuine early Christian writing? We cannot believe it.

In our next article on the Epistle we shall continue the text and parallels down to the close of the sixth chapter, but not further. We think that for the remainder of the Epistle it will be sufficient to take some passages only from each chapter. We shall, however, select enough to show that the Epistle is throughout marked by the same characteristics.

ART. III.—RELATION OF MIND AND BODY.

1. *Mind and Body*. By ALEXANDER BAIN, L.L.D. (London, 1876.)
2. *Mental Physiology*. By W. B. CARPENTER, M.D., F.R.S. (London, 1876.)
3. *The Physiology of Mind*. By HENRY MAUDSLEY, M.D. (London, 1876.)

THE increasing circulation of works such as those named at the head of this article is of itself sufficient evidence that the influence of the bodily organisation on the play of thought has now come to be a question of pressing interest and importance. The time has gone by when the study of the nature of thought and feeling was held to be as completely dissociated from that of changes undergone by matter, as, in the judgment of the ancient astronomers, the causes of movement in the heavenly bodies were from the laws of motion prevailing in this lower world, and when the idea was scouted that any light could be thrown on such a metaphysical subject as the philosophy of mind by the practical observations of the anatomist and physiologist, which dealt only with the tangible fabric of the body. That the mind controlled the body was, of course, always admitted—this governing power, indeed, was held to be one of its chief functions; but that the bodily organisation determined the play of mental action, if allowed at all, was recognised only in extreme, or what we might call aberrant cases—that is to say, while its *morbid* influence in deranging the normal state of mind pressed itself ever and anon on the conviction of men, with a force that could not be resisted, this did not lead them to acknowledge its ordinary and regular play as a factor in the development of mental action.

To those occupied with introspective investigations into the laws of thought and feeling, the direct observation of the phenomena of consciousness generally indeed proved so exclusively absorbing, that the part taken by the bodily organs in the process was overlooked; and though it might be admitted in a general way that the brain is the organ or instrument of the mind, the attempt to carry out in detail an

inquiry into the nature and extent of their association met with anything but a cordial reception from the majority of psychologists. Their conviction, perhaps, of the unity of the mind prepossessed them against the supposition that its operations could be effected by the conjoint play of the various parts which go to make up the complex structure of the human brain.

Add to this that the progress of physiology is confessedly far less advanced here than it is in regard to any other part of the body, and that, too, not only as regards the functions of particular organs, but also as to the molecular changes associated with nervous action generally. Such molecular changes as occur in nerve tissue are of far too subtle a nature to be made cognisable to our senses by any appliances as yet at our command. Their actual occurrence, though not to be doubted, is entirely a matter of inference, and as no connexion of a definite nature can be demonstrated between them and the concomitant mental action, this has indisposed many thinkers, whose attention has not in other ways been turned in the direction of physiology, from observing that intimate relation between the two classes of phenomena, which is so clearly indicated by scientific research. Hence, till a very recent period the specific action of the brain was lightly passed over by the approved writers on physiology; while the very idea, when it did crop up, that a gross bodily structure could have any share in the play of thought, was regarded by many not only as irrational, but, one may almost say, as impious and heretical. Such sentiments, there is reason to believe, still linger pretty extensively among the literary classes, and present the greatest obstacle to that impartial consideration of the question which is necessary for an intelligent comprehension of the real nature of mental action—such as will enable us to see either the true force of the physiological arguments, or the points where, by their perversion, they militate against sound views in philosophy, religion, and morality. It is not, therefore, going out of our way to bring under review a short summary of the grounds on which physiologists contend that the brain is the organ of thought, in the sense that the mental action of ordinary life in all its phases is associated with certain molecular changes in the cerebral substance.

The peculiar feelings referable to the interior of the head which accompany intense thought afford, perhaps, of themselves a certain presumption in favour of the brain being concerned in the process, but can hardly be held to go farther

than this in the way of evidence, as the peculiar bodily state of which we are conscious may possibly be nothing more than a collateral accompaniment of the mental work—both depending on some other agency. Of this we have an illustration in the excitement of the heart's action by states of mental feeling, where the connexion is so marked as to have given rise to the universal belief, in the early ages of thought, that this organ was the direct seat of emotion—a belief which, though without any physiological basis, has left an indelible mark on the popular phraseology of all races of men. Passing over this, therefore, we may briefly refer to the following as more tangible grounds for inferring the dependence of mental action on the play of the cerebral organs.

It is admitted on all hands that any capital injury to the brain arrests all manifestation of thought; but this would not of itself settle the point, as in most cases it also puts an end to life, for the brain plays an important part in most vital processes as well as in those of thought and feeling. Thus it is the seat, directly or indirectly, of the springs of the heart's movements, and of those of respiration, the arrest of either of which is presently fatal. The loss of blood resulting from decapitation would of itself indeed be the cause of immediate death in any warm-blooded animal.

Now, though the play of the functions of life is necessary for the manifestation of thought, yet, as universal experience shows that thought and feeling are not constantly in an active state during life, but are regularly suspended for a time in its ordinary course during the intervals of sleep, it might fairly be argued that the converse may hold good—that thought, though no longer capable of being evidenced by the inert body, may yet go on after death all the same as before, so far as its own mode of internal development is concerned. And in a certain sense, indeed, this is a point which physiologists are nowise concerned to dispute. Their line of research being limited to the actions of the material body during the present life, it is quite out of their way either to affirm or deny anything about the action of the disembodied spirit in another state of existence.

In the present constitution, however, of human nature there is pretty conclusive evidence to show that the course of thought may be stopped by injury to the brain, even when this is followed up by such treatment as staves off for a time the fatal issue; for as the persistence of vitality depends on

the complex association of various actions, and death ensues from the arrest of some throwing the others into disorder, it is quite possible to keep life going for a time, even after severe injuries to the brain, by carrying on artificially those processes which would otherwise come to a stop. Thus, by the alternate inflation and compression of the chest, as in what is termed *artificial respiration*, the circulation of the blood and other functions of organic life may be kept up long after consciousness is gone.

Then, again, it is well known that the different parts of the brain have not all the same office, and that those in particular which are implicated in the most necessary vital actions are quite distinct from those concerned in the processes of thought, which last function seems to be confined to the surface of the cerebral hemispheres—that large expanse of convoluted nervous matter, overlying the ganglionic bodies at the base of the skull, which is so prominent a feature in the human brain, though more or less deficient in those of the lower animals. Now, apart from the difficulty and danger of the operation required to expose this surface, injuries inflicted on it, while they have a remarkable effect in abolishing consciousness, produce little or no impression on the lower functions of life, of which the underlying masses of a ganglionic nature—so little conspicuous in our own species—are the real cerebral centres; one of them in particular, near the root of the spinal cord, being so all-important in this respect, that it was designated by its discoverer, Flourens, the knot of life (*nœud vital*), as its division or compression causes instant death, though all the other parts of the brain are left intact.

Experiments of this kind, though unpleasant to contemplate, are certainly instructive on the point in question; but it does not really require any such appalling process of vivisection to show that thought and consciousness, as they occur in the present constitution of our nature, are absolutely dependent on the integrity of this part of the substance of the brain. Natural malformations of the head, accidental injuries, and morbid seizures conclusively prove that consciousness and the power of thought are never present when this part of the brain is wanting or disabled, though the other functions of life may be comparatively little affected.

A case mentioned by the late Sir Astley Cooper as 'one of the most extraordinary which ever occurred,' affords an extreme but perfectly credible illustration of such an abolition of consciousness for an unusually prolonged time, reminding

one of the tale of Rip Van Winkle.¹ A man of the name of Jones, who had been found on board his ship in the Mediterranean in a state of insensibility in June 1799, was admitted on May 9, 1800, into St. Thomas's Hospital, in a state of unconsciousness. Being operated on by Mr. Cline, he gradually recovered, and when questioned as to the last thing which he remembered, it was taking a prize in the Mediterranean the year before ; so that he had lived a year unconscious of his existence. It was observed, during his continuance in this state, that when in want of food or drink he would grind his teeth or suck his lips ; and this is quite in accordance with what is now fully admitted by physiologists, that many actions commonly regarded as expressive of sensation are really of an automatic kind, and follow directly on certain co-related impressions on the body, even when proper sensation and consciousness are wholly absent. Such reflex actions, indeed, are often displayed more palpably in cases where the peculiar functions of the brain are in abeyance, from the removal, as it would seem, of that control which in the normal state of the system we exercise over them through that organ.

But the dependence of thought on cerebral action may be more closely brought home to us by our personal experience, inasmuch as we are all daily subject to a regular intermission of consciousness in the form of sleep. Now sleep has been clearly shown by physiological evidence to be attended by a marked diminution in the quantity of blood traversing the minute vessels of the brain, which is more urgently dependent than any other organ on a constant fresh supply of this fluid, to keep in action those molecular changes necessary for the discharge of its special functions. This is so essential that in some animals, as the rabbit—where the anatomical structure affords special facilities—a state of stupor may be induced at once by pressure on the upper part of the neck, so as to arrest simultaneously the flow of blood in all the vessels going to the brain. If this be long continued it passes on into death, but if speedily intermitted consciousness returns, and the animal resumes its former activity.

This dependence of the brain—like other organs of the body—on the state of the circulation, is shown also by the effect of changes in the condition or quality, as well as by fluctuations in the quantity of blood sent through the vessels,

¹ *The Lectures of Sir Astley Cooper, Bart., F.R.S., on the Principles and Practice of Surgery.* By Frederick Tyrrell, Esq. (London, 1824), vol. i. p. 312.

so that we have a ready method of influencing its operation, by the introduction into the system of various medicinal substances, some of which have an exciting or stimulant effect, while others act as depressors or narcotics, and others still, such as vinous liquors, induce these two apparently opposite effects in succession, by reason, it would seem, of their disturbing the nice balance, which exists in the healthy state between the play of different parts of the complex nervous system. The narcotic influence of some drugs admits of such management that their administration may be pushed far enough to induce a state of utter unconsciousness, without arresting the processes of the organic life of the body, or preventing the return of full mental activity as soon as these processes have eliminated the poison from the system.

The effect of these agents in abolishing mental power for the time is absolutely irresistible, when once the system is brought fully under their action ; but almost as much may be said of the subduing influence of mere nervous exhaustion, when it becomes excessive, from long-continued exertion. The strongest efforts of the will are incapable of resisting the drowsiness which then creeps over us. This every student must have learned from his own experience during the progress of a course of hard reading. And it is curious to observe that it is the higher powers of the mind that seem to be the first to fail. One can read a light book with comfort, after he can no longer follow out a train of argument. One may even go on reading mechanically when the words taken in by the eye no longer give rise to any connected sequence of thought ; he may force his eyes to follow the lines of print, and even pronounce the words aloud, to ensure his eyes doing their part, when he can no longer force his mind into an attitude of attention, so that he utterly fails to form any rational conception of the ideas they ought to suggest. By-and-by even this power over his actions fails him, and his auditor, if he has one, looking up to see what has caused the sudden stop in the middle of an inarticulate word, finds his companion sunk in profound sleep.

Nature has moreover provided for us, ready to hand, in the organisation of the lower animals, a series of comparative illustrations quite as instructive as any which could be derived from physiological experiment, in proof of the position now contended for, of the dependence of mental action on bodily structure, in the present constitution of our being. Throughout the whole range of vertebrated animals, from the lowest fishes to those higher species which come nearest human kind,

is to be observed a regular series of increasing complexity of structure and larger proportional size of the brain, which bear a very obvious relation to the capacities of the animal for sensation and determinate action. The psychical powers of the species at the bottom of the scale can be compared only with those concerned with such automatic actions in ourselves as breathing or winking, while in the higher forms they take a character which can hardly be denied to present some of the features of true mental action.

We have further this important physiological argument for ranking mental action as one of the proper functions of our bodily organism, that every marked exercise of thought, every powerful effort of the will, and every marked excitement of feeling, can be shown to be followed by a waste of brain substance, as indicated by the appearance in the excretions of the products of its decomposition. This is quite as observable as that attending on the active discharge of other functions, such as muscular exertion. The latter gives rise to an increase in the discharge of carbonic acid in the breath, which, according to Dr. Edward Smith, affords a very exact measure of the amount of energy put forth; but the mental work may be gauged with equal distinctness by the increased excretion of phosphates, the phosphoric acid of which is undoubtedly derived from the brain, whose substance is much richer in phosphorus than any other tissue of the body. Indeed as concerns the physiological relations of thought in the present constitution of our nature, no reasonable exception can be taken to the famous dictum of the German School, '*Ohne Phosphor kein Gedanke*,' for whatever be the objections to which some of their ulterior conclusions may be open, in so far at least it is merely the expression of the results of actual observation.

But of all the grounds for associating mental work with the play of the cerebral organs, the most telling perhaps is that afforded by the study of insanity—the morbid action of the brain, as shown in mental aberration, affording, as might be anticipated, the strongest corroborative evidence of the dependence of the healthy play of thought on its normal working. The physiology of insanity, indeed, is a subject which will, no doubt, before long receive its due share of attention in the pages of this Review, for its importance, both in a social and a legal point of view, is every day being pressed more forcibly on the public mind; and its claims to consideration can hardly be deemed of inferior weight in the religious and theological aspects of the question. The subject is one in which there is

a very marked discrepancy between the growing convictions of medical men and the established dicta of the legal profession, from which public opinion naturally takes its cue—more from a sort of conservative inertia than from any intelligent examination of the question. To go into it at present, however, would carry us beyond our limits and lead us away from our proper object; we must therefore refer our readers to the work of Dr. Maudsley on responsibility in mental disease,¹ as giving an able abstract of the opinions held by those members of the medical profession who are credited with adopting the most 'advanced views' in this respect, only guarding ourselves against being understood to endorse all his statements even as to matters of fact, while we dissent entirely from some of his theories.

Without accumulating further evidence on the subject, we think it may fairly be concluded from what has been already advanced, that, in the present constitution of our nature, mental action is always accompanied by changes in the substance of the brain. And that this applies, not only to the external manifestation of mind, but even to some at least of the conditions of its inner working, is shown by the failure as well of the power as of the consciousness of present thought, and by the loss of memory of the past, which ensue on certain injuries to the nervous substance, or on arrest of its functions from other causes.

Some of the facts recorded by medical writers, bearing on the partial loss of memory from cerebral affections are particularly instructive in this respect, as they go to prove that local injuries are frequently followed by a total failure in the ability to recall certain particular words or classes of ideas, while in all other details the memorial power may remain as perfect as ever. The subject is far too extensive to enter on at large here, but one cannot help the remark in passing, that these cases strongly suggest the notion that one office at least of the brain is to serve as a register of past impressions, from which by some complex system of lines of intercommunication, comparable to our telegraph wires, we can call up at pleasure anything once inscribed there—just as by a well-arranged index we can refer to any particular jotting in a note-book or memorandum. The instances of partial failure just mentioned remind us of cases in which some leaves of the book have been defaced, while a general haziness of memory—a much more common defect—is suggestive rather of an imperfect state of the index than of anything amiss

¹ *International Scientific Series*, vol. viii. (H. S. King and Co.)

with the jottings themselves—the memorial record exists in the mind, but it cannot be recalled with sufficient readiness.

Without venturing to assert that cerebral action runs parallel with the *whole* course of thought, this at least will probably be contended for by all physiologists, that in cogitation, so much mixed up with material imagery as that of our daily life, we could no more think without a brain than we could see without eyes—we could no more occupy our minds in reflecting on our experiences past or present, than we could communicate our sentiments about them to our fellows without a mouth for speech, or some other bodily organ as a substitute, to set them forth in form of language. As to the future, it is obviously bound up in this with the present and the past, as it is only in contrast with these we can form any conception of it.

All this may be asserted without risk of error. The danger is when we go on to push or apply our conclusions beyond that phase of human nature of which we have actual experience. Anatomical and physiological investigations, it may be conceded, afford us no ground for concluding the existence of spirit, save as embodied in a material framework ; but *neither do they prove anything against it*. They merely bring us to this confession of our ignorance—that if in other natures spiritual beings exist apart from matter, or if after the death and decay of our bodies, the spirit still remains in an active and conscious, though disembodied state, we know nothing of the *mode* of their existence and action, and that our reasons for believing in either the one or the other are not based on any evidence of a *sensible* nature. There is nothing here to conflict with the teaching of theologians, who are well agreed that our belief in the existence and activity of angelic spirits, or of the souls of the departed, is based solely on grounds of Revelation, and that beyond the comparatively few particulars actually revealed to us on the subject, we have nothing but vague conjectures, which are not always even consistent in themselves.

And here we should be very careful not to mislead ourselves by our employment of language which is confessedly metaphorical. Seeing and hearing when applied to disembodied spirits—as when used of the Deity Himself—can only be held to mean modes of cognition, suggested to us by the part played by our own organs of sense as inlets of knowledge ; and in fact theologians, when pressed to explain how the angels or the saints departed can become aware of our state, have no resource but to fall back on the position

that they, as it were, see this reflected 'in speculo Trinitatis'—that is to say, that, in some way incomprehensible to us, it is made known to them by God.

So far our argument has been that mental action, in our ordinary life, always implies concomitant changes in the material substance of the brain, but as this conclusion, once admitted, opens up a large class of questions of deep interest, it is hardly fair to broach the subject without giving these some consideration, though in regard to many of the points, we are not yet in a position to make very definite statements.

There are two aspects in which we may regard the views opened up to us by an admission of the dependence of the play of thought on the action of the brain. We have first the scientific question, whether we can follow up the general assertion of the part which the brain, as a whole, takes in mental work, by assigning proper organs in its complex structure to the several faculties of the mind, or at least by indicating what functions may be performed by the different parts of the brain in developing the phenomena of thought and feeling. This question is the more important as the answer to it cannot but modify in some degree our whole system of mental philosophy, even if it does not revolutionise it so far as does the popular system which goes under the name of Phrenology. But the moral question opened up will naturally have more interest to the readers of this Review, as it brings under consideration what bearing the doctrine of cerebral action in thought has on our freedom of will and powers of self-control, our ideas on all which points must necessarily hinge very much on the view taken of the true relation of mind and body. We will, therefore, touch as briefly on the physiological aspect of the question as is consistent with such a statement of the case as will make intelligible any reference to its leading features, involved in our subsequent remarks.

In favour of the idea that the different mental powers have each appropriate parts of the cerebral mass as their special organs, may be adduced the analogy of the several physiological actions of various parts of the lower division of the nervous system, now more or less definitively ascertained. For instance, it is now admitted that the movements of the chest in respiration, of the heart in the propulsion of the blood, of the eyes in vision, &c., have not only their special nerves as channels of excitation, but also certain parts of the brain necessarily involved in their play. There is, therefore, an *a priori* probability that to the mental functions also certain parts

of the brain are specially assigned. Assiduous attempts have been made to determine this point, in the way both of direct experimentation in the lower animals, and of observation of the peculiarities of disposition and character of individuals, in connexion with the varied configuration of the brain, as inferred from the external form of the skull—the latter being the basis of the popular systems of phrenology. But little light, however, has been thrown on the subject by either of these methods.

The latest experiments, those of Dr. Ferrier—though their value is still disputed—go to extend to the greater part of the brain proper, what had previously been generally admitted as to the lower masses of nervous matter within the skull, namely, that it also is the seat of peculiar reactions whereby impressions made on its substance excite corresponding external movements, only with this difference, that the molecular changes in the cerebral convolutions are attended with that state of distinct consciousness which is known as sensations. That is to say, the brain is not so much the organ of thought proper as of the excitement of the sensations which provide the material of thought, and of the consecutive production of the bodily actions which accompany and promote thought, and avail for its utterance or manifestation. The posterior lobes of the brain and its extreme frontal portion, whose excitation Dr. Ferrier found was not followed by movements, are comparatively small in the lower animals, even in those of advanced development, such as the cat, dog, and monkey, but they attain much larger dimensions in man, and are, in fact, what give the peculiar human character to his head. The convolutions of the frontal region are regarded by Dr. Ferrier as organs for the inhibition or control of the responsive movements referred to, his idea being that for thought and reflection it is necessary that the sensations should not be allowed to discharge themselves at once, as it were, in external expression.¹ If this view be admitted in regard to the non-excitabile region in front, it would seem reasonable to extend it to the posterior lobes also, which Dr. Ferrier is inclined, though with some dubiety, to regard rather as the organ through which our appetites and internal sensations make themselves felt.² It is with some diffidence that we venture to differ from such an authority, yet we cannot but think that Dr. Ferrier's opinion of the function of the posterior lobes is open to the same objection as the view of the phrenologists presently to be noticed.

¹ *The Functions of the Brain*, p. 282.

² *Ibid.* p. 194.

The aim of this school, in their exposition of brain action, is much more ambitious than that of any physiologist. They claim to set forth a complete philosophy of mind, associating all its endowments with the masses of brain substance on whose operation they are dependent. But it must be admitted that their conclusions meet with no general favour from physiologists. Various causes have probably contributed to bring on the disfavour with which the system is now regarded in scientific circles. A good deal may be due to the extent to which it has been made by some of its professors to pander to a wretched empiricism and to the shallow conceits of many who have come forward as its advocates, but the main cause of the collapse seems to be that the conclusions of its best writers are largely vitiated by the crudity of their ideas on the subject of the philosophy of mind. As Todd and Bowman remark, 'many of the so-called faculties of the phrenologists are but phases of other and larger powers of the mind, and the psychologist must determine what are and what are not fundamental faculties of the mind, before the physiologist can venture to assign to each its local habitation.'¹

To this we must add that the exponents of the system in the present day are by no means up to our actual knowledge of the structure and functions of the brain itself, having rested too exclusively on the examination merely of the skull, its external case. Allowing that the discrepancies have been exaggerated between this and the cerebral surface immediately underlying it, it is clear that the form of the skull gives no clue to the proportional development of the parts situated more internally, some of which belong to the same sheet of convoluted nervous matter. The want, too, of sufficient knowledge of the comparative anatomy of the brain has led them at least into one serious error—sufficient of itself to upset their conclusions. We refer to their localising the animal propensities in the posterior lobes, for these constitute just that part of the brain which a more accurate acquaintance with the conformation of the organ in the lower animals shows to be deficient in them, and present characteristically in our own species. If this part then has any connexion with such propensities, its office must be not to develop but to control their play, as Dr. Carpenter remarks in his criticism of the system.² These and such like discrepancies between the *dicta* of phrenological writers and the results of later investigations

¹ *Physiological Anatomy*, vol. i. p. 367.

² *British and Foreign Medical Review*, October 1846.

into the functions of the brain have led not a few physiologists of note, who once entertained such views, subsequently to give them up. On the other hand, it must be allowed that Dr. Ferrier's observations give some support to the phrenologists in locating the reflective faculties in the frontal region.¹

The only conclusions positively warranted as yet in regard to the functions of particular parts of the brain seem to be their ministration to the reception and elaboration of sensory impressions, and the manifestation of mental states by appropriate bodily actions. The instrumentality of the brain in proper thought, or in memory, can as yet be predicated only of the convoluted surface of the hemispheres at large, and is based on the general facts mentioned before—such as the increase of mental power concomitantly with the larger development of brain substance, the loss of consciousness and memory from injury to that organ or interruption of its functions, and the waste of nerve tissue proportionate to the amount of mental work performed.

For the dependence of memory on the integrity of the material substance of the brain there is abundant evidence, though but little success has yet attended the efforts either of physiologists or physicians to connect it with particular parts of the cerebral mass. The probability in fact must be admitted to be wholly against the existence of any single local centre for memory, and in favour of its depending on the residuary traces of previous impressions of sensation and feeling, and of the the motor efforts consequent thereon, in any part of the brain where these have occurred, and to whatever cause, objective or subjective, they were due.

Admitting, however, that mental phenomena, as they occur in our present state of existence, are associated with, and have their character determined by concomitant changes in the substance of the brain, different views may still be taken of the nature of this association. On the one hand, we may regard our being as complex, consisting of a conscious and active principle intimately conjoined with the material organism, which it uses not only for the manifestation but probably also for the elaboration of its own processes—the brain in the course of thought taking the part somewhat of the pen of the writer, or the instrument of the player. Mechanical though they be, these appliances furnish no small help in the process of composition itself and are something more than the necessary media of its outward expression. Few, if any, of our most fluent authors or speakers could

¹ *Functions of the Brain*, p. 288.

carry on their continuous current of argument, were it not constantly associated with the concomitant embodiment, as it were, of their conceptions either by the pen or by the organs of voice; and we believe the private history of some of the most celebrated composers shows a like dependence on the accompanying execution of their ideal efforts for the full perfection of their flights of harmony. As the bright idea once enunciated, or the happy musical combination once uttered, seems to afford a fixed basis for farther advance on the part of the composer, so we may fairly imagine that the result of one operation on the part of the active and conscious element of our nature, by being imprinted in the way of a memorial impression on the substance of the brain, acquires a fixity and permanence which enables it to serve as a secure basis in the further progress of thought.

But, on the other hand, we see that a very different view of the relations of mind and body is now put forward and claims to meet with a favourable reception from some of those who have the repute of occupying the most 'advanced' position as leaders of the public opinion of our day. This view, so far as we can understand the language of its exponents, involves the denial, or at least is opposed to the admission, of any distinctive spiritual element or principle in our nature. Admitting, as all must, who do not wilfully shut their eyes to what passes without us and to what passes within us, two classes of facts or phenomena—those made known to us by our external senses, and those of which we become aware by our inner consciousness—it would yet allow but one *substance* to which both classes of phenomena belong—a substance which we call material when we have to do with its sensible properties, but which has also the capacity of manifesting those other properties spoken of as spiritual or immaterial.

Not that this materialistic, or 'single-substance-doctrine'—as Dr. Bain calls it—is new in itself. It has been revived indeed with fresh energy in our own day, having received a new impulse from the prevalent views as to the so-called 'correlation of forces,' but even in last century it had a powerful advocate in Priestley. Of the line taken by this writer Dr. Bain gives us, in the work before us, a general summary, of which we have room to quote but a part:—

'He shows that matter is essentially gifted with active properties, with powers of attraction and repulsion; even its impenetrability involves repulsive forces. Indeed he is disposed to adopt the theory of Boscovik, which makes matter nothing else than an aggregate of

centres of force, of points of attraction and repulsion, one towards the other. The inherent activity of matter being thus vindicated, why should it not be able to sustain the special activity of thought, seeing that sensation and perception have never been found but in an organised system of matter? It being a rigid canon of the Newtonian logic, not to multiply causes without necessity, we should adhere to a single substance, until it be shown, which at present it can not, that the properties of mind are incompatible with the properties of matter'—(p. 183).

The more recent movement in favour of materialism has arisen in Germany, principally among the professors of the natural sciences; but their views evidently find favour also with some men of mark in our own country, among whom we may fairly reckon the author before us, to judge from the way in which he states their case in the concluding chapter of his work:—

'Their handling of it turns partly on the accumulated proofs, physiological and other, of the dependence of mind on body, and partly upon the more recent doctrines as to matter and force, summed up in the grand generality known as the Co-relation, Conservation, or Persistence of Force. This principle enables them to surpass Priestley in the cogency of their arguments for the essential and inherent activity of matter; all known force being in fact embodied in matter. Their favourite text is "no matter without force, and no force without matter." The notion of a quiescent impassive block, called matter, coming under the influence of forces *ab extra*, or superimposed, is, they hold, less tenable now than ever. Are not the motions of the planets maintained by the inherent power of matter? And besides the two great properties called Inertia and Gravity, every portion of matter has a certain temperature, consisting, it is believed, of intestine motions of the atoms, and able to exert force upon any adjoining matter that happens to be of a lower temperature'—(p. 195).

And again:—

'The rapid sketch thus given seems to tell its own tale as to the future. The arguments for the two substances have, we believe, now entirely lost their validity; they are no longer compatible with ascertained science and clear thinking. The one substance with two sets of properties, two sides, the physical and the mental—a *double-faced unity*—would appear to comply with all the exigencies of the case'—(p. 196).

The work done, as Mr. Lewes expresses it, when 'viewed from the physical or objective side, is a neural [nervous] process; viewed from the psychical or subjective side, it is a sentient process'.¹

¹ *Problems of Life*, vol. ii. p. 459.

In an earlier part of his work Dr. Bain, if not so explicit as at the conclusion, in telling us what theory he does adopt in regard to the connexion of mind and body, is at least quite decided in repudiating the doctrine of the co-existence in our nature of two substances, a material and an immaterial, 'which has prevailed from the time of Thomas Aquinas to the present day,' but which 'is now in course of being modified at the instance of modern physiology.' The view 'that the mind and the body react upon each other; that there is constant interference, a mutual influence between the two,' is rejected on the grounds that we have no experience of mind apart from body, and that there is in company with all our mental processes an unbroken material succession—(p. 130).

Were this view of the nature of mental phenomena restricted to such as are characteristic of the lower animals, it goes in no respect beyond what is strongly maintained by an author of very different proclivities, Professor Mivart. He anticipates the query—

'Is it conceivable that the arrangement of matter, in whatsoever conditions, should be the occasion of evoking from potentiality to act a power not only of living and reproducing, but of feeling and sensibly cognising, of forming associations of sensible images, of connecting therewith various emotions—a power capable of exhibiting the complex instincts of the ant, the fidelity of the dog, and the simulation of reason of the elephant?'

He then goes on to say :—

'To such objectors I would reply—How can you show that your conception of matter as it exists is adequate? . . . New combinations and collocations of matter are continually evoking new forms, and presenting to us other powers before unknown to us. What right has any one then to deny the existence in matter of latent potentialities, which experience and reason combine to show are actually now there, and in all probability have been latent antecedently?'

Des Cartes too, as is well known, held animals to be merely sentient automata. But by the author before us and others of his school it is obviously meant to explain in the same way the whole range of the activities of the human mind also.

Now it is undoubtedly the opinion of many able physiologists, in regard at least to the human mind, that we have no satisfactory ground for concluding that cerebral action covers the whole domain of thought, and other conditions

¹ *Lessons from Nature*, p. 239.

commonly referred to the soul; but even granting such a position to be tenable, and allowing that there may be 'no rupture of nervous continuity,' as Dr. Bain puts it—how this interferes with the concomitant action of soul and body in the present state of our being, we entirely fail to see.

It is true that if thought, as thought, requires, in the present constitution of our nature, the association of corporeal action for its own activity, this activity must cease after the dissolution of our bodily fabric by death, unless in the Divine economy some substitute be provided for the bodily organisation. But seeing that our main reasons, as believers, for holding the doctrine of the immortality of the soul are the intimations of it in God's revelation, the proportion of faith requires us also to hold that He will supply whatever is needful to carry out his designs in this respect, however impossible it may be for us to form any conception of his method of doing so, save in so far as He has expressly revealed it to us. The faith that gained Abraham so high a blessing, was that when the sacrifice came to be offered, God would provide himself a lamb for a burnt-offering; and if our own immortality has to be realised by a like act of faith, doubtless it will also meet with a like recompence of reward. In so far, He has, indeed, given us a revelation of his design towards us, in the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body—a doctrine harmonising, at least to this extent, with the most advanced views of modern physiology, that it represents the united action both of soul and body, as necessary for the full perfection of man's powers, as well mental as corporeal.

All, therefore, that can be said on this subject from the natural point of view is that the tenet of the consciousness of the disembodied spirit cannot be established from the conclusions of science, but, if adopted as an article of faith, must stand on evidence derived from the proper source of faith.

The other materialistic ground of objection, if solid, is more fundamental. It amounts to this that, as we have no direct experience of mind apart from body—as 'we are not allowed to perceive a mind acting apart from its material companion,' we have therefore absolutely no knowledge of its existence.

'Matter,' as Professor Ferrier makes the materialist say, 'is already in the field as an acknowledged entity—this both parties admit. Mind, considered as an independent entity, is not so unmistakably in the field. Therefore, as entities are not to be multiplied without necessity, we are not entitled to postulate a new cause, so

long as it is *possible* to account for the phenomena by a cause already in existence : which possibility has never yet been disproved.¹

This is the stock argument with all materialists, but it seems, not the less, to involve a double fallacy : firstly, in that it assumes sensible demonstration as the only source of knowledge ; and, secondly, in an abuse of the Newtonian canon, not to multiply causes without necessity. There may be some reason in maintaining that we are not entitled to postulate a new cause, so long as it is possible to account for the phenomena by a cause already in existence ; but some positive evidence is surely first called for in favour of such possibility—it does not meet the case to say that it has not been *disproved*. The difficulty of proving a negation is so proverbial, that in such a matter it may be put out of the question.

It is not merely that the phenomena of thought are different from those of a physical nature, in the sense that the phenomena of chemical action differ from those of mechanics, or of vital growth, though much more widely ; but that the kind of difference is such that it revolts our understanding to ascribe them to an essence of a like nature. 'Materialism annihilates itself,' as Feuchtersleben remarks, 'when it subtilises so far as to exalt body into mind, and this is the only way to make it think and will.'²

Of course it is possible to regard nature in such a way as to overlook the difference, but this is not to account for it. If the limit of our philosophy or power of explanation be—as Dr. Bain would seem to put it—to generalise or discern agreement among facts remotely placed, it may be quite true that, though the phenomena of mind and body 'have very little in common—though they participate only in the most general attributes, namely, Quantity, Co-existence, and Succession, and even as regards these, their participation is limited'—yet they have this one point of agreement, that they are both subject to our cognition while we are still in the body ; but if the admission of this self-evident proposition is to be the furthest limit of our philosophy, it certainly does not carry us much above the level of the simplest child of nature, and hardly bears out the author's eulogy of the result, that—

'there is nothing further to be done ; nothing further to be desired. Nor have we here any reason to be dissatisfied with the position, or

Institutes of Metaphysics, p. 229. ² *Medical Psychology*, p. 17.

to complain of baulked satisfaction, or of being on a lower platform than we might possibly occupy. Our intelligence is fully honoured, fully implemented by the possession of a principle as wide in its sweep as the phenomenon itself—(p. 122).

May we, then, have no aspirations after that which is beyond our full vision—no apprehension of truths which defy full comprehension? Must we not only acquiesce in the limited nature of our powers, but absolutely hug the chains which trammel us?

Such a philosophy would repudiate all consideration of efficient causes, as lying beyond the bounds of human knowledge, and therefore beyond the province of legitimate inquiry—a position which is compatible, perhaps, with the prosecution of physical, but hardly with that of mental science. In matter, *as matter*, we look only for phenomena, we do not look for an efficient cause. For the mere purposes of physical science it is *needless* to go at all into the question of an efficient cause, the object of such science being simply to learn the established relations of succession and resemblance among phenomena. It may even be *expedient* at times to limit our investigation to this, confining ourselves for a particular purpose to a particular field of thought, and excluding what lies beyond; for the same subject may be viewed in different aspects, and, for the purpose of obtaining a clear view of one of these aspects, it may be best for the time to exclude others. But such a view, though clear, must be limited. We can never build up a *complete* system of philosophy—as the positivists think to do—while we ignore the question of the efficient cause, even of physical phenomena.

With mental phenomena the consideration of causation is still more intimately bound up. As a recent writer observes—

‘While we are conscious of the operation of faculties within us, we at the same time feel that they are *our* faculties, that there is a Being, whom we call Self, to whom these faculties belong. We do not merely say “a thought is taking place,” nor even, “something within me is thinking,” but “I think.” Every one who reflects for a moment will be aware that when he is conscious of thoughts or acts, he is conscious of them as the thoughts and acts of the Being whom he calls Self. If he has any knowledge of them at all, he knows them as his own thoughts and acts. In other words, he knows himself as thus thinking and acting. . . . The operations of the mind may in some degree be spoken of as phenomena manifesting themselves to our internal sense as consciousness, but they never present themselves as a mere bundle of phenomena, but always in reference to that self,

which is the ground and origin of them. They are to me not merely an internal phantasmagoria, but they belong to my mind, of which they are the operations, and by which they are caused. . . . Observe, then, we have arrived at something much more than a mere phenomenon—viz. at a being, the *ground* of the phenomena, and we have also reached something more than the mere relations of succession and resemblance of phenomena, viz. a cause of phenomena, for we are irresistibly led to consider the acts and operations of our mind as phenomena in respect to which we ourselves are agents.¹

In the case of all phenomena—both physical phenomena and mental phenomena—if we push the inquiry to the uttermost, we are led on to something beyond the material substance in connexion with which the phenomena are manifested, for their true efficient cause; but there is this difference to be observed, namely, that in the latter case, that of the mental phenomena, the cause is in some sense a personal spontaneity of our own. If, then, in the former case a religious philosophy leads us up to the Divine Spirit as the *primum movens* of the physical universe, we are surely but following a sound analogy, when in the case of the latter we conclude that the human self which is interposed, as it were, between the phenomena and the First Great Cause, has so much affinity to his nature as to take it out of the category of mere material substance.

The positive arguments for materialism are mainly founded on the association of mental with corporeal action, not in some few isolated instances, but in all cases which come under observation, whether we apply this to the animal kingdom at large, or to human nature in particular. Wherever, and in what degree, there are indications of mind, there also we find the co-existence of a proportionally distinct nervous organisation, and have evidence of its activity. Particularly striking is this coincidence in the maturation of mental power *pari passu* with the advance of the bodily growth of the child, and, on the other hand, the recurrence of childishness and imbecility in the decline of life, even where there is no absolute perversion of the mental faculties, such as would indicate a misdirection of power really present, by the inappropriate play of the disordered machinery with which it has to work. Does this (says the materialist) look as if the body—necessary as it may be in our present state of existence to the manifestation of the mind—is, after all, merely its instrument, and even, in some respects, more of the nature of a drag on its action?

¹ Shaw, *On Positivism*, pp. 21, 23, 25.

Even more telling, perhaps, is the argument founded on the failure of our consciousness on the access of sleep. As long as any of the special actions necessary for the performance of the functions of the brain go on, so long some degree of mental capacity remains: but on their cessation utter unconsciousness comes on—to be succeeded, however, by a return of our mental faculties, immediately on the resumption of cerebral activity—either perfectly at once, or after a brief interval of confused thought. If it be argued that our conviction of the loss of consciousness during sleep is due, not to an actual cessation of mental action, but to the want of any memorial impression to assure us of it, from the abeyance of the material organ of memory in the brain, on which an impression may be made necessary to give fixity to the passing states of mind—if the adjunct of a material organ of memory is thus needful to give the spiritual element of our nature that consciousness of continued existence which is essential to our idea of personal identity, what conception can we form of the state of a soul wholly severed from all bodily connexion whatever?

We have been anxious to put these points as forcibly as possible, because it is never safe to underrate an opponent's strength, and to our judgment, they are the most powerful weapons in the whole armoury of materialism. Whatever view may be taken of the case, the difficulty raised by them is undoubtedly very great.

Is it, however, so certain, as is here assumed, that the play of the brain organs, or *cerebration*, as it has been termed, is co-extensive with the play of the mind? Such, at least, is not the constant teaching of physiologists. Dr. Kirkes, for instance, in summing up the arguments on this point, and setting forth as their general conclusion that 'the cerebral hemispheres appear to be the organs in and through which the mind acts in all those operations which have immediate relation to external and sensible things,' goes on to say that 'the reason or spirit of man which has knowledge of Divine truths, and the conscience with its natural discernment of moral right and wrong, cannot be proved to have any connexion with the brain;' ¹ that is, in their own proper sphere, for he admits that in the complex life we live, they are often exercised on questions in which the play of the brain is essential to mental action.

May it not be that the one field, as it were, overlaps the

¹ *Handbook of Physiology*, 5th edition, p. 472. In the later editions by Mr. Baker this limitation is omitted.

other? The brain is but a part of the general nervous system, certain portions of which are concerned with the processes of mere organic, or of animal life, such as circulation, respiration, and locomotion, which come only casually, or not at all, within the province of the mind. Of the play of some of these functions, indeed, we are quite unconscious. The principle of reflex action—that is of motion consequent on nervous impression—so happily applied by Marshall Hall to the explanation of the movements both of organic and animal life, in which the ganglia dispersed through the trunk and the axis of the spinal cord are the centres concerned, has since been extended by Laycock and Carpenter to the higher parts of the brain, associated with proper mental action. In all alike the probability is, that there are, as it were, two parallel sets of phenomena—physical and mental—though not both equally prominent in different cases. In most of the actions of organic life (circulation, digestion, &c.) the consciousness is so little impressed that the movements are unfelt, except either on a morbid strain of introspection—as when the hypochondriac gets a perverted and mischievous impression of their hidden work—or in consequence of their unusual intensity, as in some inflammatory affections. In those of animal life, we are generally cognisant of their occurrence, but often only in a passive sort of way.¹ We need probably a voluntary effort to set off a fresh series of such actions, as in walking; but once it is started in a familiar groove the train runs on of itself, while the thoughts may be very differently occupied. And so it may be also, according to Dr. Carpenter's theory of unconscious cerebration, even with the nervous processes in the higher parts of the brain, which form, as it were, the substrata of thought. For it is forcibly contended by this physiologist, that some even of these operations are performed, not only automatically—that is, simply in virtue of the mutual adaptation of the structures concerned—but also unconsciously. The brain, he conceives, elaborates by the play of its own machinery certain results, which come under our conscious cognition only when fully worked out. Of this he gives an illustration in the spontaneous recurrence to the

¹ It is not meant here to imply that the consciousness is associated with the lower nerve centres from which the motor impulse of these actions emanates. It may arise from the consecutive implication of the higher centres which are played on, as it were, by those first impressed. The sensibility of the axis of the spinal cord in itself is disallowed by most physiologists, and that even of the lower centres within the skull is a disputed point. Dr. Ferrier would restrict true sensation to the convolutions of the brain.

mind, after an interval, of the solution of some difficulty, which we had put aside in despair, after puzzling over it a while to no purpose.

The possibility of these results being evolved in such an automatic or mechanical way, will hardly be questioned by one who considers the working of the so-called calculating engines, or of the clock-work machinery in the Bank of England for the numbering and registration of notes, and who bears in mind at the same time the complex and elaborate nature of the tissue of the brain, which in this respect is a veritable microcosm or *multum in parvo*—the array of nerve cells and fibres which are there packed up rivalling both in number and intricacy the telegraph stations and wires not only of the United Kingdom, but probably even of the whole extent of Europe. Dr. Carpenter ascribes this occasional unconscious working of the cerebral mechanism to our attention not being directed to it at the time—

‘Just as we may not see things which are passing before our eyes, or be conscious of the movements of our legs in walking if our attention be wholly engrossed by our cerebral train of thought, so we may not be conscious of what is going on in our cerebrum, whilst our attention is wholly concentrated upon what is passing before our eyes.’—(p. 15).

Our limits forbid us going further into this curious subject, which Dr. Carpenter has treated at length and with his usual felicity of expression in the work before us. We would not be understood to say that his views are universally accepted, but they seem to be substantially in agreement with those of Liebnitz, Sir William Hamilton, and other metaphysicians of note, and are such at least as cannot be summarily put aside. Anyhow the extension to the brain of the principle of reflex action—now well established in regard to the lower centres of the nervous system—implies that the reaction of the cerebral substance from the impression made on it by the organs of sense may become at once the cause of appropriate bodily movements, which will of course be the expression of thought and feeling, if there is thought or feeling to express, but which may also occur independently of these, when, by diversion of the attention, the appropriate mental state has not been aroused.

When, however, by a proper act of attention, this necessary relation is established between the conscious mind and the cerebral organ, the outgoing changes in the latter, which result in motion, become apparently a source of consciousness as much as the impressions made on it by the organs of sense. In what way either one or other can affect the con-

sciousness is of course quite beyond our comprehension. How any conceivable arrangement of any sort of matter can give us mental states of any kind is equally inexplicable, whatever view we adopt as to the existence or constitution either of mind or body; but admitting as a matter of fact that cerebral changes are followed by mental states, there seems to be quite as much evidence for attributing our ideas and memory of words to the working of the cells and fibres in the anterior region of the brain which represent movements of articulation as in ascribing our notion of the visible picture of nature before us to the molecular changes transmitted to another part of the brain lying farther back from the optical image formed in the eye.¹

Anyhow, when the consecutive mental action is once excited, it may well be held to be not merely *sui generis*, but also vastly wider in its range than that of the cerebral organ. If the doctrine of unconscious cerebration be admitted—if it be allowed that brain may act without the conscious mind in points, which, if not properly mental, are at least ancillary to mental action, may it not be, that in operations more removed from sensible impressions, the spiritual element of our nature works alone—reaching forth, as it were, beyond the scope of that material organism with which it is associated in its lower field of action? The general ideas which inevitably arise in our minds, in consequence of the exercise of our senses, are at once perceived, as Dr. Alison remarks, when the attention is fairly fixed on them, to have an extent of application far beyond what the senses themselves can ever reach. ‘The notion of time is no sooner formed, than it swells in the human mind to eternity, as surely as the notions of space and number to infinity.’²

The same conclusion is forced upon us by the contrast of our own mental faculties with those of the highest of the brute creation. Differing so entirely as they do, not only in degree but in kind—man possessing those moral endowments and powers of abstraction of which we find no trace in the lower animals—we should naturally expect, if these higher faculties were essentially dependent, like the lower, on the play of the cerebral organisation, that there would be a corresponding difference between the human brain and that of the animals nearest man in the structure of the body generally. But as a matter of fact it is not so, for the brain

¹ Dr. J. H. Jackson, *Physiological Researches on the Nervous System*, p. xxxiii.

² *Outlines of Physiology*, p. 327.

of the higher apes differs really less from that of man than from those of the lower mammalia, and the points of distinction, such as they are, consist not in the want of any structure occurring in our own species, but merely in the less development of parts, which are to some extent represented in both.

The weak point we apprehend in the line of argument of the materialists, is that it contents itself with negation, and does not meet the whole case, by failing to take into account the positive evidence we have for the distinct existence of the human soul, because it is not of a kind to yield sensible proof.

'It is nothing less than marvellous,' as Dr. Mivart observes, 'to note how completely they ignore all its highest faculties. They are profuse in their elucidation of the power of mere sensation, and the consequent faculties of brutes, as well as of the materials of our own thoughts, but they give us no increased knowledge of our own intelligence itself. Our cat's mind is indeed made clear to us, but not our own. Those supreme conceptions and perceptions of our minds—Truth and Goodness—reflexly contemplated as Truth and Goodness, are simply passed over.'¹

That the whole range of thought and feeling, known to religious writers as the spiritual life of the soul, should also be ignored, is less surprising. It is indeed with great diffidence that, even in support of the received doctrine, we venture to touch at all on this point, as it is one which none but a spiritually minded man can handle with effect.

Granted that in the ordinary play of thought there is always some amount of bodily (cerebral) action, yet, from the testimony of those best qualified to speak on the subject, instances must be admitted in which a man is so taken out of himself, as it were, as to pass into a state in which this either ceases to be the case, or in which at least the amount of bodily action bears no proportion to the flight of the spirit. The very nature of meditation on Divine things, indeed, is in this way to raise the soul from its corporeal associations, and confer on it an impressibility by spiritual influences, which is otherwise unattainable. 'The natural man,' we are told, 'receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.'

It would be but consonant to the general laws of physiology to suppose that this increase of spiritual susceptibility, by abstraction from bodily influences, involved a corresponding

¹ *Lessons from Nature*, p. 48.

failure of those powers of sensible perception and memorial retention of which the bodily organisation is the special instrument. Hence, though the state of the mind may be permanently altered in consequence, it were no wonder we should be quite at fault in our endeavours to discover how the change is wrought, or to describe the particulars of our experience bearing upon it. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth, so is every one that is born of the Spirit.' Are we not justified in holding that such a state of matters obtains in all that higher kind of prayer, which is not merely a petition for some tangible gift—such as one might ask of a fellow-man—but a lifting up of the soul to God—a pouring out of the spirit before him—an actual intercommunion between ourselves and Him in whom we feel ourselves to 'live and move and have our being?'

We have selected this case of meditation on Divine things as probably the nearest approach we can imagine in this life to spiritual apart from bodily action, but it would seem that the apprehension of the difference in the abstract between right and wrong, and our power of choice and self-control, are essentially of the same kind, though as all these must pass into the concrete, when we have to determine our own conduct, or judge that of others, there must, in practice, be a constant recurrence to that sensible imagery of persons and actions which involves also cerebral changes.

In limiting ourselves here to the experience of ordinary life, we purposely leave out of consideration the whole question of Divine communications of a supernatural kind, such as S. Paul speaks of to the Corinthians, and in regard to which he felt himself unable to say whether he was in the body or out of the body. Many delusions there have, no doubt, been in this respect, but it is useless to deny the occurrence of cases for which the evidence is convincing to any candid mind; and it would indicate rather a presumptuous confidence in our own shallow judgment summarily to decide in particular instances how far they are to be explained by the ordinary laws of thought involving cerebral action, or how far they belong to a different and higher sphere. Without questioning there being a vast amount of imposture or delusion in the so-called spiritualistic exhibitions, which have been lately put before the public, one may fairly contend that there may be true spiritual communications as well as false, and that the very prevalence of crafty imposture and superstitious delusion indicates the existence in human nature of

something responsive to spiritual impressions, and affords as fair an argument for the existence of a corresponding reality in the spiritual world as our sensations do for the existence of material objects around us. If the illusions on the one hand, to which our senses are liable, do not upset the general veracity of their testimony, no more should such delusions, on the other, be held conclusive against the reality of spiritual entities. And this argument becomes all the stronger when we find that the fantastic spiritualism of the present day is rampant just in proportion as the more sober spiritualism of a religious life is discredited. It looks certainly as if human nature were thus avenging itself on the advancing ultra-scepticism of our age, according to the Horatian maxim—

‘*Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret.*’

So, too, one might argue as to the spiritual nature of certain dreams, or at least of those singular moral impressions which are felt at times on awaking from sleep. Dreams there have undoubtedly been, through which most deep and lasting moral impressions have been wrought, sometimes with, sometimes without, the distinct remembrance of sensible images. In so far as dreams involve such sensible images, which may even excite us to movement at the time, and which leave a more or less distinct remembrance when we awake—they are generally ascribed to the sleep, though perhaps profound, being but partial—some of the cerebral centres continuing more or less in a state of activity, while others are dormant. But the moral impression left on the mind on awaking is sometimes out of all proportion to the distinctness of the remembrance of the details of a dream; and it is, perhaps, just as feasible to ascribe the latter in certain cases to some spiritual influence so powerfully affecting the soul, as through its agency simultaneously to affect the cerebral organ in the way of a memorial impression.

A question, such as that of the distinctness and spirituality of the soul is one, it must be admitted, which can hardly be discussed without a certain movement of the feelings. This may be deprecated by the philosopher as biasing the judgment; but with most thinkers it is unavoidable, and where it does not take place, there is ground for suspecting that its absence is due to some mental idiosyncrasy which may be in its way as inimical to arriving at a just conclusion. To ordinary minds the question has at least a prospective interest of the most overwhelming importance. A materialistic view need not, perhaps, of itself involve the conclusion of our utter

annihilation after death, any more than the prospect of an indefinite extension of a future life need altogether exclude this ultimate issue. As the Buddhists look forward to an eventual 'nirwana,' or extinction, as the culminating goal of unnumbered transmigrations, so materialists, like Priestley, have professed their belief in a resurrection life, while repudiating, as, of course, they must, any intermediate state of conscious existence after the dissolution of the body. To most minds, however, the prospect of an untold interval of total oblivion must of itself be sufficiently depressing, and it needs but little acquaintance with human nature to see that in the great majority of cases disbelief in the separate existence of the soul will lead on to doubts as to any life hereafter at all—and, what then? 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'

That there are great and embarrassing difficulties in any conception we may attempt to form of the conscious life of the soul, after the collapse of the bodily life, may be freely admitted, but the difficulties of its denial seem to us to be so much greater, that nothing could force its repudiation on a religious mind but a demonstration of its impossibility, which never has, and in the nature of things, never can, be given. 'Though He slay me, yet will I trust in Him,' is the sure reply of the religious instinct, be its logic what it may.

By such an instinct, it would seem, has the Christian Church ever clung to the belief in the continued consciousness of the soul after death; for while it holds a prominent place in her devotional language—as, indeed, it did even in the myths of heathenism—we find throughout the New Testament the doctrine of the immortality of the soul so merged in that of the resurrection life, that few passages can be cited which make definite statements in regard to the former as distinct from the latter. May not the explanation be that while the life and capacities of the soul in a separate state raise a question wholly transcending our understanding, the future glorified life in our risen bodies is a theme on which the imagination can rest in a degree, as it has some affinity in kind with our present composite life, however much we must of necessity fail to realise its fulness of bliss and perfection of power? This, at least, is always the goal to which the sacred writers point. Such expressions as 'the glorified spirits of departed believers,' however they may find favour in the popular religious language of the day—whether Protestant or Catholic—are certainly not scriptural.

In full reliance on the boundless power and love of God,

the dying Christian may with confidence resign his soul into his Father's hands, though in utter ignorance of the state into which it is about to pass. He may even, when sore wearied with the trials of this life, the temptations it may be of the flesh, and the infirmities of the corruptible body which 'preseth down the soul,' be led to exclaim with S. Paul that he longs to depart and to be with Christ, which is much better—'that it is better to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord,'—but he will surely go on with him to say, 'not that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon with our house, which is from Heaven,'—not that the soul may be freed from the body, but the body itself freed from the power of sin and death; for the conjunction of body and soul is as fully recognised by the divine as it can be by the physiologist, to be the condition necessary for the perfect action of both.

It is not, therefore, that the body, as such, is a clog to the soul, but that the body, in its present sinful and corruptible nature, is not an adequate instrument for that perfection of action, which the soul may attain in its full maturity; and that the temporary dissolution of the former is a step, in the Divine economy, in its progress to a higher perfection. In explanation of death we are referred to the analogy of the germination of seeds—'Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die.'

Then, again, in the decline of life, as the mortal body becomes less and less capable of discharging even its present functions, we should naturally expect a concomitant failure in the manifestation of mental vigour, but this tells nothing against the idea that the capacity of the soul itself may be ever on the increase—its development ever tending upwards to that higher part which it has to fill in the future life, as the animating spirit of the glorified body.

If these suggestions of grounds for our conviction of the distinctness of our spiritual essence, from all mere corporeal action, are crudely put forward and defectively stated, it does but justify the reluctance we expressed to enter on a topic which, though perhaps not to be left unnoticed, can be satisfactorily dealt with only by a master of the spiritual life—while even such a one might probably find himself embarrassed by the inadequacy of human language, based as it is on sensible images, to express relations of so purely spiritual a kind.

On the most practical and matter-of-fact view of morals, however, the question before us has this important bearing, that it very sensibly influences our estimate of personal re-

sponsibility. If our corporeal and mental actions are but twin concomitant results of the operation of a single essence—that is, of the material substance of the brain and parts associated, they must be held to be determined both alike by the laws regulating the course and succession of physical phenomena—while, if there are two agencies at work, though the final result must still be largely influenced by such laws, seeing that all our actions, while in the body, are so far the acts of the body itself, even those of a specially mental character—still, as the latter are not the acts of the body alone, but also of the soul, they must be farther influenced to some extent by *its* principles of action; and these principles—definite as they doubtless are—may yet be different in many respects from the laws of physical action, and such as to give scope for that conditionality and power of selection which underlie our idea of free will and personal responsibility.

In such an alliance both of the partners must have their say, and if, on the one hand, we may plead the immutable operation of natural laws, on the other we must be answerable for the liberty allowed by the conditionality of moral law. If there are limits—variable or fixed—beyond which the will is powerless to coerce the organic functions of the brain, and if there are natural laws of nervous action, according to which it must be worked—within such limits and subject to such laws, the cerebral mechanism may reasonably be held to be as much at the bidding of the animating spirit as the pen is under the command of the writer, the musical instrument of the player, or any other piece of machinery of its overseer. The hypothesis adopted—if, in a purely scientific point of view it must be so termed—affords, we submit, by far the most feasible explanation of the many complex problems of social life; and this consideration alone would warrant its assumption on philosophical grounds, so long as all that can be said on the other side is that no such demonstrative evidence can be given of the separate existence of the soul, as appears convincing to some of our opponents.

Concerning the limits, however, and the degree of responsibility in different cases, there remains much room for legitimate difference of opinion, which can be removed only, if at all, by a free and full discussion of the whole question. The influence of the bodily organisation in determining the conduct and character and in modifying the power of self-control, though it comes out more strikingly in cases of insanity, is no doubt operative in some degree in all men; and it may be freely allowed to affect the moral responsibility of individuals

in the sight of God. The extent to which any court of jurisprudence could admit such a plea must of course always be very restricted, but allowance ought certainly to be made in this way in forming our opinions of the conduct of others, for the sake of justice no less than of charity.

It is even still more important that we should form a right estimate of the amount of self-control which we have really in our own power, for there can be no doubt that lax views on this point, and the lack of energy which naturally results from them, are, as a matter of fact, the real causes of much of the misconduct and lawlessness that prevail in the world. It is not only, we should bear in mind, that a man's own disposition will be morally deteriorated by allowing himself in bad habits, over which directly or indirectly he could exercise any voluntary control, but that he may entail the evil results on generations yet unborn; for the balance of mind, on which character so much depends, may be conclusively shown to be influenced very greatly by the conformation and constitutional habit of body derived by hereditary transmission from his parents or even from more remote ancestors. In this sense at least it is a law certainly as wide as human nature itself, that the sins of the forefathers are visited on the children to the third and fourth generation.

It is in his treatment of this determining power of the will over character, that Dr. Maudsley's teaching on the subject appears to us most defective, from the one-sided view he takes of the question. The Will, according to Dr. Maudsley,—who in this seems to follow Hartley and Hobbes—is nothing else than the appetite or liking put in action after deliberation. Its deliberate character allows scope for the play of different impressions, all tending to influence the final result, which may come in consequence to be very different from what it would have been had the primary impulse passed at once into effect, as in the instinctive actions of the lower animals; but it is no less the necessary result of the combined operation of the several conditions of sensation and feeling which have preceded. That the result cannot always be foreseen is owing merely to the complexity of the antecedent reactions surpassing our powers of calculation, and still more to our ignorance of many of the factors, and not to any independent act of self-control affecting the balance of the mind. Did we know all the facts and could we solve all the equations involved, the result would come out as rigidly as a problem in astronomy, or any calculation in applied mathematics. It is freely admitted that different

men will act differently in the same contingency, but this is not because one, by his personal will, aided by the grace of God, exerts greater moral control than another over the promptings of his animal nature, but because this animal nature is itself so far differently constituted that by the hereditary transmission from their ancestors, and by previous education and training in their own lifetime, the nervous processes give rise to different proclivities in different cases. Rejecting thus the idea of independent self-control, he consistently repudiates also that of moral responsibility. Guilt, of course, in such a view is but a meaningless word, and while social responsibility is admitted in so far that a certain recognition is extended to the salutary influence of penal discipline in preventing crime, punishment is held to be legitimate only as providing a deterring motive, and in no sense as vindictory or called for by an abstract sense of justice.

It is allowed indeed that the old fashioned figment of moral responsibility has done good service in its day :—

‘How can men on each occasion be most powerfully instigated to seek good and ensue it, when the balance of personal desires and propensities is commonly on the opposite side? Clearly by inculcating in the most impressive manner possible the doctrine of free will and responsibility, at the same time that are presented to them the strongest motives for moral action that can be fabricated—namely, the most vivid pictures of the unspeakable joys of heaven as the reward of well doing, and the endless torments of hell as the punishment of ill doing. In this way we constrain them at the critical moment by a powerful motive to act rightly, and aim by enforcing the repetition of right acts to foster a habit of acting rightly and to work by degrees a better nature in them ; for each moral act, by the law of nervous action which has already been illustrated largely, renders the next more easy, and so the nature is gradually modified. The process is really one of moral manufacture Then the individual is said to have acquired the greatest strength and to manifest the most perfect freedom of will, because he is able to do right in the midst of ever so many temptations to do wrong ; and thus the highest freedom of will is cleverly identified with the highest morality. Liberty is the voice of conscience ; conscience is the voice of God, say the theologians.’

But in the enlightenment of the end of the nineteenth century, ‘*nous avons changé tout cela*’—as the Ultramon-
tanes now say of the teaching of Bossuet—for the author continues :—

‘It would appear then from what has been said, that the doctrine of free-will, like some other doctrines that have done their work, and

then, being no longer of any use, have undergone decay, . . . was necessary to promote the evolution of mankind up to a certain stage. . . . On the one side is the motive to do right, on the other side is the motive to do wrong—the former more difficult, the latter more easy to do; by proclaiming free-will, we strengthen the former motive, while by proclaiming necessity it is clear we should strengthen the latter motive in the unenlightened or inferior person, who with short-sighted ignorance would gladly go the easy way of his passions, rather than the arduous way of his true welfare. The notion of free-will and its responsibilities was necessary, therefore, and perhaps still is, to make for him a higher necessity than the necessity of his passions, but it does not follow that it is necessary for him whom Confucius would have described as the sage or superior person, who looks to the endless consequences of his actions. To him the clear recognition of the reign of law in the human mind will furnish the strongest motive to do right'—(pp. 419-421).

It is certainly rather singular to find so zealous a champion of the truth against the arbitrary dicta of 'theologians' seriously maintaining the utility—nay, the necessity—of basing the education of the bulk of mankind on a doctrine which he goes on to characterise as 'an effete superstition, the offshoot of ignorance, mischievously drawing men's minds away from the beneficial recognition of the universal reign of law, and of their solemn responsibilities under the stern necessity of universal causation.' On our part we are far from questioning that there is in his argument a certain element of truth. While his language is occasionally needlessly offensive, and his allusive use of Scriptural expressions in contradiction to their obvious meaning is certainly far from edifying, to the substance of most of his *positive* statements we should not in fact care to make objection.

The actions which result from the will may be admitted to differ from those of an automatic and instinctive nature very much on account of their more deliberate character—that is, in the greater number of motive influences which have had a share in their production—and these motive influences must be allowed in turn to be largely due to the bias given to our mental constitution by hereditary transmission and personal training. What we contend for is, that over all these is the personal will, in the position, as it were, of a judge or one in authority—liable indeed, as is a judge, to solicitation from all sides, but morally bound also, like a judge, to decide according to abstract principles of equity, and free, that is competent, to do so, if not by its own power, owing to the deterioration of our moral nature—yet by the

help of Divine grace, which is freely given to all who seek it. To those who admit neither a personal God, nor a personal soul, all this is of course but foolishness—but to such as maintain these tenets, this freedom of will, and supremacy of conscience, are not only in full harmony with their belief, but are necessary to give it full consistency.

It is not maintained that all our actions have this active voluntary character—not even all those in which we seem at first to be really following our own inclination. On many occasions it is true that we are passively led by the preponderating motives which affect us at the time; and in the case of what are called weak characters, this is perhaps the common state of matters. But it is no less true that there are occasions in which after full deliberation we elect to follow a course which we perceive to be in opposition to the resultant impulse of all the involuntary attractions and repulsions acting upon us, and make an anti-impulsive effort, as when from the love of God we deny ourselves an immediate gratification from an indulgence, in which we do not perceive any remote evil consequence to ourselves. If the will does indeed necessarily follow the stronger motive, we are at least so far free in the matter that we have the power of intensifying one motive at will, by fixing the attention on it, and so making that motive stronger for the time.¹

That we are liable to fallacies in regard to our freedom of will, as in other matters, is not to be denied. There is much truth in Dr. Maudsley's remark, that a man often thinks himself most free, when he is most a slave. 'When is it that man is most persuaded that he speaks or acts with full freedom of will? When he is drunk, or mad, or is dreaming. . . . Passion notoriously perverts the judgment, warping it this way or that.' Yet there is surely no more reason why our conviction of our general freedom of will should be set aside by our liability to such fallacies, than that our reliance should be shaken in the general trustworthiness of our bodily senses by the well-known illusions to which they also are occasionally liable.

In Dr. Carpenter's treatment of this subject, we find a larger and sounder estimate taken of the extent to which we have, directly or indirectly, in our power, not only the formation of our own character, but also an influence in modelling that of others by judicious discipline, especially in the early years of life, and of our consequent responsibilities in both these respects. One point indeed we miss, which

¹ See Mivart, *Lessons from Nature*, pp. 121, 124

seriously impairs its practical value, in that no account is taken of the natural depravity of the human heart, which lies even more than mere ignorance at the root of our failures, or of those remedies and helps which Christianity provides to meet the case. We do not of course mean to object to a treatise on the philosophy of mind that it keeps clear of the theological bearing of points which it brings before us, but neither may we admit that, apart from the religious aspect of the case, we can have either the moral questions treated exhaustively, or any rule of practice laid down which will be of itself a sufficient guide for the regulation of our conduct.

The conclusion then to which all we know on this subject clearly points is the composite aspect of human nature—composite not only in the character of the phenomena exhibited, physical and mental, but also in the agency concerned in their production. In so far this conclusion is quite in harmony with the popular conception of man consisting of soul and body, entities distinct in nature, but acting and re-acting on each other; both of them in the ordinary course of life being concerned in all we do, say, or think, but so associated together as to constitute a perfect unity in all our actions.

We use here advisedly the term 'composite' rather than 'dual,' for though man's mental nature obviously includes in its fulness the lower powers of mere animal life, and the threefold term, spirit, soul, and body, is used by S. Paul to express the completeness of his being, yet, as we have seen, there is an agreement among some of the representative authors of very different schools in regarding the so-called mental action of the lower animals as a mere property of the living fabric, or as the manifestation of a special modification of force, rather than as due to the association of a distinct entity corresponding to the spirit of man. The popular opinion, however, is probably still that of Cudworth:

'They who will attribute life, sense, cogitation, consciousness, and self-enjoyment, not without some footsteps of reason many times, to blood and brains, mere organised bodies in brutes, will never be able clearly to demonstrate the incorporeity and immortality of human souls.'¹

This question does not lie before us at present, but in human nature at least, we do contend for such a spiritual element, though, in common with all who have viewed the subject from the corporeal side, we feel constrained also to admit that there is a necessary accompaniment of cerebral

¹ *Intellectual System of the Universe*, iv. 44.

action in all ordinary mental operation. As for this very reason we can have no such proof of the existence of a spiritual, as distinct from the corporeal factor of our nature, founded on its separate activity, as would appear sufficient to one determined to base the case on sensible demonstration, our arguments for the existence of the soul, as distinct from the body, must rest mainly on metaphysical grounds, and on our consciousness of moral and spiritual relations—a kind of evidence, indeed, which is liable to be ignored by those who from neglect or wilfulness look only at one side of the question, but which will be found of irresistible force by such as give a candid consideration to all its bearings, and the repudiation of which has invariably led sooner or later to the most fearful errors in moral practice, and in all the relations of social life.

ART. IV.—CHRISTIAN SCULPTURE—THE DECADENCE.

1. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Fictile Ivories in the South Kensington Museum.* By J. O. WESTWOOD, M.A. (Chapman and Hall.)
2. *Early Christian Sculptures.* By Professor WESTWOOD. An Appendix to PARKER'S *Archæology of Ancient Rome.*
3. *Historical and Monumental Rome.* By Mr. C. J. HEMANS. (Williams and Norgate, 1874.)

IT is unnecessary to say that the three works on our list are valuable contributions to Church history, as well as to the archæology of the primitive and Byzantine stages of the Christian Church. We know not how widely they will be appreciated in either character. Mr. Hemans' books have the weight of personal observation and verification, and cannot be omitted by any student of ecclesiastical or mediæval history, except, perhaps, in the University of Oxford, where such subjects do not pay in the schools, and are therefore untouched alike by tutors and pupils, and unrepresented in that annual issue of school-books which pours from the Clarendon Press.

We wonder how far it was foreseen, when the principle of competitive examination was made the exclusive rule of Oxford

emolument, that the acquisition of knowledge would become so largely a commercial pursuit. Our Universities are perhaps rather too much than too little *en rapport* with the country, whose indifference to unproductive learning they are forced to reflect. Of course the Press can only issue books which will command a remunerative sale, and this must be found with schools in search of scholarships, or undergraduates in search of classes, and the latter, directed and examined by tutors who have no time for new documents of history which are not in their line, are unable to pay much attention to the books before us. *Quocunque modo rem.* Parents invest heavily in preliminary grinding for their quicker or more willing sons, because a fellowship of 200*l.* a year is a capital return on about 1,200*l.* sunk with that view. That, or some other start in life, is what they want from the older Universities, and they get it. The examinations are as fair and as clearly announced as such complicated things can be; there is not a tutor in Oxford who does not do his best to win with such pupils as he can get; and a great deal of information really is acquired in course of the necessary training. Almost every tutor in residence, having once competed himself into his place, has to go over his work again and again in teaching till he has really mastered it; and the great majority keep up a steady effort at honest work with their pupils, besides the remunerative coaching. We do not complain, it is so ridiculously useless; but until the examining tutors think it worth while to gather some knowledge of the remaining original documents of the times they examine about—that is to say, the sculpture—the men will not think it worth while either; and Professor Westwood and Mr. Hemans will be read by much fewer and more careless persons than ought to study them.

The *Catalogue* at the head of our list, with the Essay founded on Mr. Parker's *Roman Photographs*, cannot be properly described here. The former necessarily depends on its beautiful and accurate illustrations, which do South Kensington full credit, showing how faithfully first-rate work can be rendered, when author and artist are combined in the directing master. The smaller work cannot be compressed any further; and is already almost too much condensed, presenting the greatest amount of matter in the narrowest space. And it is difficult to avoid paying the same quasi-compliment to Mr. Hemans. To us a great attraction of his style is that it is rather difficult to read. It gives us full assurance of a rare thing, that is to say, of an American, whose knowledge is more than he knows how to display, and whose

feeling is beyond his powers of expression. We do not mean to say that men of letters on the other side of the Atlantic are less full of information than the same sort of men here; but they are better accustomed to speak at length of what they know. Now Mr. Hemans' mind is really 'crowded' with history, archæology, and personal study of documents and topography; and if there were any real fault in his style, it would only be more dear to us. We shall have to quote him very speedily, and much of Professor Westwood's work will be found embodied or embedded in this paper.

The latter begins his Essay with some remarks on the decadence of Sculpture in Rome. They seem to lead to necessary explanations which may best be made here. By Decadence we understand decline, and by Sculpture we mean Greek sculpture. What the work of the Pheidian age was in principle and inspiration; how it changed in Athens after the death of Pheidias; how sculpture was transferred to Rome as part of the plunder of the world; and how it served the needs of Rome;—all this is matter for another Essay of some difficulty. What concerns us at present may be expressed in the following questions:—

1. In what sense, and how far, was there a decadence of Art, especially of Sculpture, before the existence of the Christian Church?

2. What part or what features of the decadence of Sculpture may be traced to the Christian Church and her principles?

3. About what time, and how, may we suppose the Christian influence really began to bear on sculpture, so as to affect the technical character of works of art?

1. It is not possible for us to trace the decline of the Pheidian schools into the Praxitelean, or the substitution of sensual for spiritual motive in Art, in this paper, with any minuteness. We must assert that such a change did take place. Many will say, not without reason, that Sculpture improved after the death of Pheidias, and continued to produce beautiful works for a greater or less time. Nevertheless it is true, and quite enough for us, that the Græco-Roman Sculpture of the Augustan age—technically excellent as it was, and full of good portraiture,—came after chryselephantine Athené and the Elgin marbles, and was by no means equal to them; so that a downward course was certainly begun before the Augustan age. This will hardly be contradicted, and though the relations of fine art to manners, morality, and religion are a weary and vain subject of discussion, they force themselves upon us here.

Those who will read Grote's *History* or Becker's *Charicles*, and compare them with Count Rio's *Art Chrétien*, will see that Greek Sculpture grew more sensual because Greece grew more vicious; that the relation of the sexes in Athens was of a character to destroy family life, and to undermine domestic purity and self-restrained affection, and all their influence in favour of the stability and decency of society. They will see that by the time Greek Art was ready for transference to Rome by Æmilius and Mummius (who may stand as representatives of the well-meaning general of culture and the rough general of plunder), Greek Art at that date was not in a state likely to awaken any particular respect in the Roman mind. The gods were captive gods; the heroes had not done much for their people; the athletes must have been better in a ring than in a phalanx; the nymphs of Corinth were Corinthian nymphs. Honest Mummius and the plundering pro-consuls destroyed much more Art in Greece than the Early Church ever did; and they failed to respect Greek Art for the same reason as she,—that they saw no good in it. It seemed all mixed up with laxity and disorder to them, as it seemed hopelessly involved with idolatry in the eyes of Tertullian. The family life of Rome was still a thing of honour and of awe. Men and women were true to each other: a domestic worship and solemn rites of sepulture, in particular, kept order still by Roman hearths. But this family life was especially desirous of good portraiture of ancestors gone forth to join the Lares, or of triumphant Consulars of the house: so that when the cunning Greeks and their fair works were brought home, Rome only adopted the part of their skill which seemed to her best worth having, viz. their sculpture of portraiture and their sepulchral bas-relief. And to this day, if any branch of Sculpture can be called Roman, it is this. Then Roman morals and discipline decayed, the triumphs were repeated to weariness, the savage games of the amphitheatre drowned all Art-power in blood, and Rome never cared to study the higher decorative beauty. But on the engineering side of Art, she emulated and excelled the wonders of Egypt. Temples, roads, bridges, cloacæ, baths, and basilicas, reproduced Rome in every province, and as Sculpture was not yet separated from Architecture, the Greek carver and his pupils were a part of the pomp of Rome throughout the world; and working for his patrons, he never rose higher than the taste of his patrons. He had long been only a minister of equivocal pleasures; and if Roman ideas of pleasure were more pompous and

gross than Hellenic, he had only to be a little more profuse and loaded in his cornices, and to produce somewhat more indecent statues. Again, in due time Orontes flowed into Tiber, and all kinds of Eastern ideas were forced into the Greek schools. Syrian, Egyptian, Indian, and Mithraic models struck the eyes of travelled senators, and they wanted all their beauties united in Græco-Roman halls and temples, exactly on the same principle on which Chinese pagodas used to be erected in English parks. In short, cruelty, sensuality, pride, and travelled ignorance directed the Roman demand for Art; it was accordingly supplied, and Art became an exponent of these qualities. The unconquerable Greek sense of beauty and fitness long went on producing good workmen, while Rome could understand good work; but we may say that that capacity had pretty well died out of the mistress of the world by the end of the second century.

2. The decadence of Art means the decadence of artists, as traceable in their works. In periods when national spirit is extinct; when spiritual hope is shaken by mutual anathema; when all high intellects and noble spirits are passionately engaged, as for life, in theology, war, or politics; when earnest religion is either persecuted by the State, or corrupted by the patronage of the State; at a time when the energies of one great race had enveloped the world and were dying out in crime; when Roman city-life had taken the place of the country-loving tastes of ancient Attica; when Caracalla placed his hideous head, with a fearful unconscious symbolism, as deified Emperor on the shoulders of Capitoline Jove—in such times as succeeded the days of the Antonines, we do not expect any good Art, and we do not find it. Tacitus and Gibbon have not yet been criticised into nothing; and they give us pretty definite ideas of the state of Rome from the first to the fourth century. For the progress of her Art, there is no better sketch of it than that given by Seroux d'Agincourt,¹ and it most happily illustrates the following quotation from Mr. Hemans; which appears to us to possess many of the attributes of real grandeur, especially that of unconscious power. For D'Agincourt's text and plates, we know not if it be too much to ask the reader to refer to a very well-known work, which should be found in all large libraries. At all events, any student of history who will make our reference will see in five minutes what the decadence of Art is, and the

¹ *Histoire de l'Art par les Monuments*, vol. ii. 17, 27 *sqq.*, and vol. iv. 'Sculpture,' planche ii.

plate in question is still (in great degree) verifiable by photographs :—

‘When the light of the setting sun,’ says Mr. Hemans,¹ ‘blent with the mellowing touches of time, gives an almost golden tint to the Arch of Constantine, as it rises in marble relief against the background of ilex and cypress trees on the Cælian Hill, we may dwell with interest, in the pleasant evening hours, on the contrasted characteristics of Roman Art at its zenith and in its deep decline, alike presented before us on the storied surface of that monument. The highest excellence of Roman sculpture is exemplified in the reliefs and colossal statues of which the now lost Arch of Trajan was despoiled, to adorn this later trophy of imperial victories ;—while the period of decline, almost to a level with barbarism, is represented by the bas-reliefs prepared in honour of the first Christian Emperor.’

Now we cannot help observing, that whereas this passage points out the unquestionable truth that Art had fallen to a level with barbarism before there was a Christian Emperor, a great many people of our time would read it as if the accession of a Christian Emperor straightway reduced Art to barbarism. It will not be seriously contended that within ten years of a fierce persecution, in the early peace of the Church, or during the hundred years between Trajan and Constantine, the Church of Christ had done anything worse to Art than let it alone. It is proved that the Church had already been making her own use of Art to the best of her power. We shall produce examples of Christian sculpture long after Constantine's days, which are nearly as good as the figures from the Arches of Titus or of Trajan. We think it hard that Attic taste should be expected of Christian confessors as a class ; that the hacked and branded Paphnutius, for example, or the maimed veterans who had led the battle of the Lord against fire and lions, should be expected to admire the graven Apollos in whose honour they were systematically broiled. But all must acknowledge the eloquence of Libanius and Gibbon, who, we presume, believed in about an equal degree in the deity of Apollo, or of anybody else : and we think it possible that in after days ‘Christian mobs’ may have destroyed much third-rate sculpture, though they never burnt down Corinth, or plundered Athens or Delphi.

Had it been possible for the Empire so to embrace Christianity as to give the Faith her perfect work at once and throughout, the same power which gave men strength for martyrdom might have enabled them to renew the life of their expiring civilisation. But the dreadful enmity of the

¹ *Hist. and Mon. Rome*, p. 318.

Empire, and its yet more terrible decay, impressed the severity of suffering on the Church of Christ, and the Ascetic or Byzantine phase upon her carving and painting. The immorality of the outer Romano-Greek world enforced ascetic separation on the Church in about an equal degree with its cruelty; and sculpture was not only allied with idolatry, but seemed particularly open to imputations of immorality. It must be remembered that the marriage tie was utterly disregarded in Roman society, and that with it, all domestic relations were sadly loosened. The choice seemed, to many converts, to be only between celibacy and general concubinage. Hence the general decay of art, and the moral repulsion to it in the Church, as distinguished from the Hebraic or doctrinal dread of the graven image, and the associations of idolatry and persecution. Hence came also the attraction of the eremitic or monastic life, from despair of the natural relations of society. The ascetic system was the reaction of Christianity from Pagan social habits, as the iconolatrous system in after time was the reaction of Paganism on Christianity. The new faith took men as it found them, and found them as Juvenal and Tacitus describe them. It must have been often quite an ordinary resolution of self-exile, if men or women fled to the desert, or anywhere out of the world of Corinth, Rome, or Alexandria. Old habits, connexions, and friends had to be broken with; and S. Augustine's *Confessions* show us the bitterness of partings, which the hope of a purer life made necessary, and which must often have made Scetis or Sinai the sole refuge of the shattered penitent.

But, given the Ascetic artist as a necessity of Christian life after Constantine, you have the ecclesiastical or Byzantine style at once. It is true Neo-Greek; but, if you will, it usurps and barbarises Art. Well, Rome had done so before, without adding any new spiritual element to art. We do not know what Pheidias would have said to the Composite Order, or of the Composite entablature, with its intermingled columns and arches of support, and its tedious overloading of unmeaning sculpture. The word *Savavola* would probably have occurred to him. But if he had seen the great mosaic of SS. Cosmo and Damian, where Our Lord comes with clouds, walking as on the floor of heaven, and having under His feet the darkness of the sky—then he would have recognised a barbarism which meant something, and which certainly did appeal to the world of Spirits as if that world were real. Had Pheidias been led in spirit to see what sad and strange

work Greeks had made of the arts of his rejoicing youth and manhood, his Attic senses would have told him he had found something of that feeling of awe which had filled the Parthenon in his day, and had departed from Greece and the world with him. Of course, if he compared the Art of Constantinople with that of Periclean Athens, he would have seen that Greek work was utterly fallen. On comparing Greeks as he had known them with Greeks as he now saw them, he would have felt that his race was fallen too. Yet he would probably have paused to inquire what these strange temples meant, with their splendour of hue and sadness of form. And he might have understood the difference between worship in humility clinging to hope, and in victory content with this world. But one thing would certainly have struck him; that these Neo-barbaric Greeks knew all about colour, and rich effect under dim light; and that the gigantic pictures on the vaulting filled the dim apse with the same kind of power and majesty as the vast presence of his own Athené had communicated to the Parthenon. He might have thought, in many a Christian temple, that these people, at all events, wanted to do what he had done. But at sight of the Venus de' Medici he would have said its carver had done what he, Pheidias, never wanted to do.

These great single figures in mosaic may be mentioned here, because their effect is statuesque, and because they produce, as the Eastern Church came at length to understand, all the impressive effect of a carved image, without ministering nearly so much to the idolatrous instinct. But now we think we may give our own answers to our own three questions:—First, Sculpture had been in gradual decadence as to aim and subject from the fifth century B.C. And when the patronage of Rome had fully engrossed all Art, so that subjects involving the luxury, pride, and cruelty of conquest were added to the usual carnalities, and such works were alone in demand—taste in execution, and therefore power of handwork, declined rapidly as well—this decay commencing directly after the Augustan age. Secondly, the Byzantine phase of Art is due to Ascetic Christianity. By the beginning of the fifth century all demand for Art, as far as we know by remaining monuments, was based on spiritual motive;¹ and

¹ 'Une circonstance particulière,' says D'Agincourt, with dry emphasis, 'm'a imposé la loi de parier de ces cimetières souterrains: c'est que les productions de la sculpture et de la peinture qui ont servi à les orner, sont à peu près les seuls monuments des premiers siècles de la

all spiritual life was involved with ascetic feeling, and generally with ecclesiastical rule. Byzantinism is not barbaric decadence, but barbaric reinspiration or renaissance. This leads to our last answer—that, thirdly, the fourth century is the great period of Christian sculpture, until the time of Niccola Pisano; and we must now, with the assistance of Mr. Hemans, Professor Westwood, the works of Bosio (in their different editions) and those of D'Agincourt, give some account of its remaining monuments and examples.

Secular or Pagan sculpture in marble ends after Constantius, though the consular ivories are a different branch of the art. The beginning of its end may be fixed soon after the death of the first Antonine, in 161 A.D. There had been fluctuations from good to bad, and then to worse. 'Sculpture,' quotes Professor Westwood from D'Agincourt (p. 1), 'was grand and noble under Augustus' (Vipsanius Agrippa probably held it, with other things, in good Roman order, *testudine et facie*), 'licentious and obscene under Tiberius, coarsely obsequious under Caracalla (who caused his own infamous head to be placed on the fine Greek statues), and extravagant under Nero, who gilded the famous *chef-d'œuvre* of Lysippus.' Then there was a partial revival, under Trajan and Hadrian, in decorative arts as well as architecture; but with the calamities of Aurelius' reign the great dissolution began. After his days, Rome was governed from distant camps or cities, by Rhine or Euphrates, and Constantine's transference of the seat of power was really anticipated by Severus and others. Readers of Gibbon or Dean Merivale will see little to wonder at, and certainly nothing for which to accuse Christianity, in the barbarisms of the Arch of Constantine. Its worst offence is peculiarly Roman, and consists in the robbery of statues and bas-reliefs from the Arch of Antoninus: but the fall of sculpture, even from the Flavian Emperors to Constantine, is best seen, as we said, by means of D'Agincourt's plate,¹ which we venture to describe here, for the sake of paralleling it afterwards with relics of Christian sculpture.

The figures compared are all copies in the first instance; so that they test mere workmanship and power of execution.

décadence, et même des deux siècles précédents, qui sont parvenus jusqu'à nous.'

¹ We have compared the plate with Parker's *Photographs*, using a good glass, and can only say that D'Agincourt is faithful in the parts to which we refer, though the Victories of the Arch of Titus seem rather more upright in the actual work.

First, the Victories in the spandrels of the Arch of Titus are good second-rate sculpture of the time, originals or not; those of Septimius Severus are certainly copied and spoiled from them, and Constantine's, again, from the latter. The Flavian Victories are tall, beautiful maiden figures, by no means voluptuous; their drapery is expressive of 'the great wind of their going'—they bear small banners lightly in strong fine hands, and the sculptor has not unsuccessfully striven with the difficulties of a winged human figure. They look as if they might fly, with the help of their floating drapery, and are free from that broken-backed appearance which has characterised most representations of the heavenly host, in flight, from that time to this. Those of S. Severus are huddled in the spandril, ungracefully short and broad, like heavy housemaids; they are sulkily struggling with ponderous staves supporting small trophies; they have coarse throats, and the massive leg of one of them is outstretched in air, with the calf-muscles set, and the thick foot in the instinctive attitude which is generally enforced by a sudden attack of cramp. Their countenances are grossly offensive; and all their faults are zealously exaggerated in their repetitions on the Arch of Constantine. Again, in D'Agincourt's plate, a single head is selected from each column—the first is beautiful in every sense; the second, only in the vulgarest sense; the third is intolerable.

Comparing the bas-reliefs in Titus' triumph, the bulls are well carved from the Greek ideal; and a fair amount of repose is given to the whole, because the figures have standing-room and do not crowd each other. Nobody shoves, as in the crowded groups of the later arches. And we venture here on a truism, which we have not lately seen, that there is a great difference between a crowded bas-relief and one in close order. The knights of Athens, in the Elgin frieze,¹ are in an unnaturally close procession, and their horses are certainly under fifteen hands. But the grand unity of action in man and steed throughout, and the thoroughly considered, though conventional positions, sustain the idea of solemn procession before the indwelling Goddess. One never thinks

¹ A student of Art and History will find it very useful to compare the Elgin frieze with the fine horsemen on the base of the Column of Antoninus, in the Vatican Gardens (*Parker*, 328), and then with those on the porphyry tomb of the Empress Helena (209). The latter dates A.D. 330; that of S. Constantia twenty years later. It is ornamented with a vintage-scene, which, with the mosaic of the same subject in S. Constantia's Church, may have reference to Our Lord.

of the tramp or the neighing, and one forgets that two-thirds of the extraordinary little nags before one are nearly sitting on their tails. The Septimian frieze is huddled with figures who seem to be pushing and disputing, in conventional rhetoric, where they are to go; and the Constantinian have no composition or artistic arrangement at all, but consist of short Dacian soldiers, apparently retreating on tiptoe, horses and drivers alike without legs, and small square carts on the principle of the modern bicycle, with both wheels on one side. The draughtsmen employed by D'Agincourt seem to have failed him grievously in their representations of the large statues of Constantine, his sons, and of S. Hippolytus, in *Sculpture*, pl. iii. vol. iv. Bad as the originals are, their heads cannot have been one-third too small. But the bathos of Sculpture was now reached; and if Mr. Hemans' interesting conjecture be right, that the inscription on the Arch contains a first dubious recognition of Monotheism by the Senate ('instinctu Divinitatis,' instead of 'nutu Jovis O.M.,' or other like form), the coincidence may strike the artist-historian forcibly enough. It is as if the branch of Art which had ministered most closely to idolatry was literally withering and dying in contact with the Faith, only to be restored by passing through a new Christian archaism. To this, at all events, Roman sculpture had come, before it passed under Christian Imperial patronage. We shall give instances of improvement in Sculpture under this rule, and may, just in passing, call attention to this—that the great architectural idea, as grand in its technicals as in its symbolism, of the central dome and fourfold basilica, is due to early Imperial Christianity, and characterises the first splendour of the city of Constantine.

Single statues in full relief, and of unquestionably Christian workmanship, are very rare indeed; the Primitive Church seems to have felt the common-sense difference between a bas-relief—which is in fact a picture, and generally contains numerous figures, or represents an historical event—and the isolated form standing as it were to receive adoration, or even as a subject of contemplation. Again, the great additional difficulty of producing even a tolerable statue, with the steady demand for sepulchral carvings, must have led the Christian carvers to fall back on bas-relief for the most part, which, as Professor Ruskin has explained, is virtually deep engraving, or drawing in *natural* light and shade. Not more than four or five statues can be pointed out as having a Christian origin, from all the treasures of the Vatican, the Lateran, and

the Capitoline Museums, and the majority of these are figures of the Good Shepherd, an image familiar to Greeks and Romans probably since the days of Calamis. The paintings of the Callixtine and other catacombs sometimes follow the Pompeian-Roman ideals of shepherd life and the care of the flock. Perhaps the best heathen example of this is in the very beautiful shepherd (Faustulus or Romulus) of the tomb of Statilius Taurus, lately discovered, and just photographed by Mr. Parker. These paintings will be of great importance when compared with the earlier works of the catacombs. But the more frequent and familiar type of the Good Shepherd bearing the sheep on His shoulders is certainly derived from the Hermes Criophorus of Calamis. A woodcut of this statue is given in Seeman's *Götter u. Heroen*,¹ and no one can doubt that it was a well-known work. It may have been harmlessly adapted in his mind's eye by some Christian artist; or some Christian patron, soon after the peace of the Church, may have ordered a copy of it, with such changes as best reminded him of the Lord's parable of Himself. The shepherds of the Lateran and Vatican collections are both of the Greek type, after Calamis. Their workmanship is so good that they have been assigned to a much earlier period than the fourth century; but the tomb of Bassus, which bears consular date A.D. 359, possesses figures of equal merit, and purer Greek form. These shepherds are about two feet high; both in tunics, cross-banded hose and boots; the Vatican figure bearing the *pedum*.² There is another rather inferior though ancient statue of the same in the Kircherian Museum of the Collegio Romano.

The only other early Christian marble statue in the Roman collections is that of S. Hippolytus, Bishop of Ostia, now in the Lateran.³ The arms and feet of his cathedra end in lions' heads and claws, and on its side are inscribed, in Greek characters, the Paschal table, and a list of his works.⁴

The bronze, or, as Mr. Parker says, bell-metal statue of S. Peter in the nave of S. Peter's at Rome, must be referred to here, though there are grave doubts about its being an early work of art. Professor Westwood's account of the question

¹ See also Raoul Rochette, *Sur les Types anciens de l'Art Chrétien des Catacombes*.

² For parallel works, see Aringhi, *R. Subterranea*, pp. 75, 79, vol. ii.; Originals, Parker, *Phot.* 2903, 2901; Westwood's woodcut; also in Martigny's and Smith's *Dictionaries of Christian Antiquities*.

³ Parker, *Phot.* 2899; figured in Bunsen's *Life*.

⁴ *Phot.* 2936; D'Agincourt's *Sculp.* pl. iii. 1; Perret, *Catacombes*, v. i.

seems perfectly impartial.¹ If it be true, as Mr. Parker asserts, that an outer varnish of bronze has disappeared under the kisses of generations, so as to betray that the statue is of bell-metal, which was not used till the twelfth century, this somewhat retributive fact fixes the date of the statue in the thirteenth century, when the Church was rebuilt. There was undoubtedly, as Professor Westwood observes, a well-known statue of S. Peter at Rome in the eighth century; for Leo the Isaurian threatened to destroy it, and Gregory II.² twice mentions it as the image of S. Peter, in his letter to Leo. But this³ was probably the fine statue now in the crypt, the body of which is antique, the head thirteenth-century. A small standing bronze figure of S. Peter, with the later or upright cross-monogram, is figured by Martigny,⁴ and in Munter's *Sinnbilder*, pl. 6, f. 21; and these seem to be all the Christian statues to be found in Rome, notwithstanding the zealous labours of Seroux d'Agincourt, which extended over his fifty years' residence in Italy. He was unable to discover any well-authenticated work of sculpture of the higher character between the above and the twelfth century.

But with sepulchral bas-relief it is very different. No tablet with distinctly Christian character can be assigned to an earlier period than the fourth century. If any such exist, in the Vatican or elsewhere, their authenticity is utterly lost by their removal without record from their original site. We have no room for complaints on this subject; and those who are led through the great galleries in the course of their studies of Christian archæology will find many pleas for the generally highly venerable perpetrators of these outrages of a thousand years and more. Their excuse is generally founded on the unsafe and unprotected condition of the original sites.⁵ It seemed better that inscriptions and sarcophagi should be collected in the Papal palaces, especially in the Vatican, than that they should be destroyed altogether; and hence the mania for museums of unregistered sculptures, and the chronological mistrust which hangs over the whole subject. The plea was doubtless valid in the days of the Lombards; but

¹ See Burgon, *Letters from Rome*, London, 1862, p. 57-8, as to the present custom of adoration.

² *Gibbon*, vii. 193, 194.

³ Parker, *Phot.* 2995.

⁴ *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Chrétiennes*, s. v. 'Pierre.'

⁵ For the successive plunderings of the Catacombs, see the late Mr. Wharton Marriott's article, s.v. 'Catacomb,' in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, with authorities.

in modern times it amounts only to a reflection on the police, if any, of the imperial city. The earliest and most beautiful of all Christian sarcophagi, as we have said, is known by its consular date of A.D. 359.

Terms of Greek and Roman sepulture often lead to useful explanations, and illustrate the relations of heathen and Christian life. The word sarcophagus, as we remember, from Smith's Dictionary, is derived from the singular quality possessed by the stone or marble of Assos, which was said to destroy or absorb the whole substance of a buried body in forty days, excepting the teeth. Hence all stone coffins came to be called sarcophagi, flesh-consumers. The Roman tufa seems to have been of an absorbent character, and to have assimilated and dispersed the moisture of decay. And though placing a dead man in a stone coffin seems a natural thing in all ages which have had plenty of workable stone, we may just note the difference between the cell cut out in the living rock and the detached coffin. Christian *loculi*, the tombs at Xanthus in Lycia,¹ and many of the mansions of the great Majority who occupy the limestone slopes of Ophel and Hinnom, are of the former character; the marble sculptures we have to describe are of the latter. It may be enough to say as to the former, that the ideal or rudiment of a primitive Christian grave is the *locus* or *loculus* cut in the granular tufa of the Catacombs—that is to say, a longitudinal niche in the wall of a narrow passage in the rock; and that in the case of martyrs, higher clergy, or other well-remembered persons, it was customary first to hollow out an *arcosolium* or small half apse above the *locus*, and then to flatten its surface into a table-tomb or altar, on which Holy Communion might be celebrated. Lastly, the apse or altar-end of a small *cubiculum* or chapel was completed by cutting the rock away all round the oblong tomb, ornamenting its sides with carvings, and the vault above with fresco or mosaic.

This method bears close analogy to that of the Xanthian tombs, which (as in many other instances, and pre-eminently at Petra) have pediments and fronts cut in the solid to complete them, and are handsome *ædiculæ* instead of humble *loculi*. The great classic example in Ethnic Rome of the combined use of sarcophagi and of *loculi* in the natural rock, is, of course, the Tomb of the Scipios, well described and illustrated in D'Agincourt;² and it thoroughly and in all respects establishes the connexion between pre-Christian and Christian burial in Rome. D'Agincourt places above it,

¹ Fellowes' *Travels*.

² *Sc.* pl. xii. and p. 25, vol. ii. text.

on the same plate, the altar-tomb or sarcophagus of S. Hermes, with ornamented front and vaulting. It still existed, in 1780, in a Catacomb on the Salarian Way, bearing the name of that Saint, who is said to have been prefect of the city in Hadrian's time, and to have suffered martyrdom.¹

The present state of the Christian cemeteries, deprived as they are of the marble sculpture which once formed their chief ornament, gives an impression of poverty and distress which they certainly cannot have displayed when in use. Hence, and from the acknowledged exaggerations of monastic hagiology, a popular idea of misery and abjectness attaches to the Early Church, which has led to undue contempt for its art work, as if it were not only bad in execution, but unworthy of notice as a part of historical record. It suited Gibbon to give a similar impression of the Church's history, and his shadow has brooded over it ever since, from Constantine to the Crusades. But idiot emperors, adulterous empresses, intriguing bishops, mad monks, and savages like George of Cappadocia, though they form good foils for Aurelius and Julian, do not fairly represent the body of the Christian Church from the third century. As the great writer somewhere observes, 'happy is the nation which is without a history.' Sometimes we have thought there may indeed be a posthumous blessedness in not having any historian. But these sarcophagi with the other tombs give us a notion of a great mass of unrecorded Christianity, which, doubtless, lived perturbed and distressed, as most Anglican priests and people do now, in decadence of faith, public spirit, and national life. As a body they seemed, perhaps, only a little more chaste in their lives than their heathen neighbours, and a little better organised for ministry of charity in times of pest and famine; somewhat willing to forgive personal injury, though prone to dispute on spiritual matters; a little more hopeful of some great blessing to come in the hour of death, better than all Elysium, and as sure as Death himself. Perhaps some among them lived luxuriously; but as a rule their lives were better ordered than if they had not served Christ. At all events, they said He dwelt with them in the world of Rome or Constantinople; and passed and ended their lives in endeavours to realise His presence. Appealing to Him all their days, at all hours, they made their sepulture bear silent witness for them after their days were over. The poor man had his rude epigraph of fish, shepherd, or monogram of the Divine name; the rich lay in his marble

¹ See D'Agincourt and Hemans, pp. 352, 355.

chest, adorned with the history or symbols of Christ. And to give a sketch of the subjects of these sculptures, first, He is always their principal Form, more rarely¹ as Shepherd than as the Vine of Souls; oftenest as worker of the miracles of mercy, or in His Person with His disciples. His Passion is scarcely represented further than in His appearance before Pilate. Once He is crowned, but with flowers, as it seems, instead of thorns. Many times He is symbolised as Jonah, from His own promise of the Resurrection; or as Noah, Isaac, Moses, Elias, or the various typical persons of the Old Testament. But He, or His works, or symbolic persons or actions, are always the subject of these sculptures. They are arranged either horizontally or vertically. In the first case the front of the sarcophagus is occupied with one or more ranges of figures; in the other, the whole space is divided into niches by columns, sometimes wreathed with the vine, sometimes bearing rich fanciful capitals which anticipate Gothic variety; sometimes palm-trees separate the full-length figures in the niches, almost always of the Apostles surrounding their Lord.² This latter form of composition, though somewhat perpendicular in its appearance, has a considerable technical advantage, even over some of the older classical work, in that its centre of interest is so well marked,³ and that the form of Christ predominates. But, as in heathen tombs, portraits of the dead on central panels are very common. Sometimes the tomb is only channelled or strigilated around them, but they are generally surrounded by imagery of Him who is the leading thought of every Christian tomb. The great anti-Christian historian, and his obsequious or apologetic successors, have told us the worst of what Christian people did and thought in life. These Christians have written for themselves in marble, what they looked to in death. And certainly, for the present, nobody receives this part of their witness—least of all anybody in the academic centres of

¹ Parker, 2938 and 2217: Sarcoph. of Julia Juliana, Lateran. (Supposed third century, with far too deep undercutting, like Indian or Japanese sculpture—to our mind resembling the reliefs of Sept. Severus.)

² One of the peculiarities of the beautiful tomb of Junius Bassus is that it is gracefully divided out in medallions between columns. The equally celebrated one of Probus and Proba (he was Prætorian Prefect and belonged to the great Anician family) dates 395, and is the best example of the vertical or niche system of treatment. See text. This sarcophagus is to be found in Parker, *Phot.* 451, in Bosio, *Rom. Sott.* pp. 49, 51, 53; same plates, Aringhi, i. pp. 281, 283, 285, and Bottari, vol. i. tavv. 16, 17, 18; also in D'Agincourt's *Sculp.* pl. vi. fig. 12.

³ Parker, 2924, 2909, 2927.

Anglicanism, where it is no more inquired about in theological competition than in any other of the schools.¹

¹ The following list of subjects, taken from the works of Prof. Westwood and the Dean of Chichester, is in order of frequency,—at least as far as the specimens in the Lateran Museum and Bosio's plates from the Vatican collection can go:—

1. History of Jonah, various incidents.

See in particular Parker, *Phot.* 2905—a remarkable piece of fifth-century sculpture; with small groups of Noah, Lazarus, and Moses; also the Good Shepherd, and Arrest of S. Peter. The reversed or redoubled sea-monster, swallowing Jonah one way and ejecting him the other, is highly ingenious. Can this have been copied from metal-work on some round goblet or crater? The fishermen and allegorical figures of the Sun are quite Græco-Roman. 23 in Lateran, 11 Bosio.*

2. Moses (occasionally Peter) striking the Rock, 21, 16.

3. The Miracle of Loaves and Fishes, 20, 14.

4. Apprehension of S. Peter, 20, 14. Soldiers or Jews in peculiar flat caps.

5. The Cure of the Blind, 19, 11.

6. Miracle of Cana, 16 and 8 times.

7. Raising of Lazarus—a mummy-like figure bound hand and foot in grave-clothes, standing at the door of an 'ædicula' or chapel-tomb, 16, 14.

8. Christ with the Cock, reference to S. Peter, 14, 8.

9. Daniel between two lions; sometimes with Habbakuk and loaves, 14, 7.

10. The Paralytic, generally bearing a kind of sofa-bed, 12, 7.

11. The creation of Eve, 11, 2.

12. Sacrifice of Abraham, 11, 9.

13. Adoration of the Magi, 11, 8.

14. The Temptation. Adam often with a sheaf of wheat, and Eve with a lamb, 10, 14. This curiously reminds us of Jack Cade's motto, 'When Adam delved and Eve span.'

15. The Woman with the bloody flux, 8, 9.

16. The Good Shepherd, 6, 9.

17. The Entry into Jerusalem; the people strewing garments and branches; Zaccheus very often; sometimes the foal of the ass, 6, 8.

18. Noah in his square chest or *arca*, with the dove, 5, 6. The extremely curious and interesting derivation of this ideal of the Ark, from coins of the Phrygian Apamea (called *Kιβωρίς* or 'the treasure chest,' an important emporium) will be found in Raoul Rochette's *Types anciens des Peintures des Catacombes*.

19. Our Lord before Pilate, the latter generally washing his hands; a second figure is sometimes present, who may be Herod.

20. Adam and Eve receiving the wheat-sheaf and lamb from the Second Person of the Trinity, 4. See 14.

21. Moses and the Law, 4, 6.

22. The Three Children (with Phrygian caps) standing in a low furnace (can it be like a Roman *ustrinum* for cremation?) in the attitude of prayer, among flames, 4, 3.

23. Christ bearing his Cross, three times in the Lateran. Burgon, p. 250.

* Bosio's plates, as given by Northcote and Brownlow, are from 43 sarcophagi; 30 of which were found in the crypts of the Vatican.

Christian sculpture, then, except in works like Junius Bassus, the two Shepherds, and some other performances of unusual skill, has the faults of fourth-century sculpture, and with this additional disadvantage, that there is no secular sculpture of its date to compare it with. The art of the Christian cemeteries must be studied, says D'Agincourt, because it is there, and there is none other, after the second century. There is, indeed, so little identified or accessible, that Christian fourth-century work has to be compared with classic of the second at latest, and its technical inferiority is obvious. That is to say, the best Christian is weaker than the best heathen, in anatomy, in composition, in Greek grace, and freedom of careless fancy,¹ in the life of limbs and forms studied by skilled draughtsmen from fresh-and-fresh nature. We may conjecture with moral certainty that the artists by the end of the second century had ceased to practise draw-

24. Moses removing his shoes, 2, 2.

25. Elijah translated in a *quadriga*. Elisha, the Mantle, and two little Sons of the Prophets,—perhaps children with the bear (Parker, 2932), 2, 3.

26. The Nativity, with ox and ass, 1, 4.

27. The Crowning with Thorns, 1, 1.

Other rarely represented or highly interesting subjects are—

a. Our Lord on the Holy Mountain, whence issue the four Rivers of Paradise, attended by His disciples. Not unfrequent in the Vatican and Lateran sarcophagi as represented by Bosio.

b. 'Thou shalt go on the Lion and Adder:' Youthful Christ, on a sarcophagus, at S. Nicolò at Ravenna.

c. The Last Supper, passing as a funeral-feast—frequently seen on sarcophagi. A semicircular table, with crossed cakes of bread (Parker, *Phot.* 2928, 2930.)

d. The Vision of Ezekiel, on 2 or 3. *Phot.* 2921. The Saviour standing in the act of raising small (apparently shrivelled) dead figures.

e. Daniel and the Dragon (Parker, *Ph.* 2920.)

f. Susanna and the Elders—dubious.

g. Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea (*Phot.* 2933).

h. Offerings of Cain and Abel (*Phot.* 2908, 2910.)

i. The Woman of Samaria (Bottari, pl. 137; Aringhi, i. 297; D'Agincourt, *Sculpture*, pl. viii. fig. 9.)

j. The Baptism of Our Lord (Parker, *Phot.* 2677, 2919; Bottari, pl. 193.)

k. The Daughter of Jairus raised, from a sarcophagus (Parker, 2919, 2920; Bottari, pl. 193.)

l. There is an interesting sarcophagus from the Catacomb of S. Helena, figured by Fabretti (*Inscr. Antiq.* p. 587, and D'Agincourt, *Sculpture*, tab. viii., fig. 19), where a Christian sculptor has represented himself at work on a sarcophagus with his assistants, and the inscription ΑΤΙΟC ΘΕΟCΕΒΕC ΕΥΤΡΟΠΙΟC ΕΝ ΙΡΗΝΗ—with the dove and olive-branch in the corner.

¹ See bas-reliefs, *Phot.* 2886, 2887—Lateran Museum.

ing from nature.¹ They could not possibly have lost the proportion of heads to stature of bodies if they had gone on drawing at all ; and nearly all the Christian sarcophagi suffer from this ; some little,² some grievously.³ Their crowded figures must be noticed immediately ; but one palliation, the sign of important difference of feeling and the forecast of all the coming development of Christian Gothic sculpture, has to be taken first—which is, that the countenances of some of these figures seem to have been worked at with great care, perhaps with affection, as portraits of dead friends. It may seem strange, but we think any portrait-painter would agree that the faces in Parker, 2907, *e.g.*, are those of real persons. One is three or four times repeated (the attendant on Pilate, spectator's right) and may have been a favourite model. Our Lord's face is apparently studied from some dark-eyed girl's ; and to turn to the other extreme,⁴ we do not think anybody in that stage of Art could have invented the 'S. Peter as Moses,' or the satellites who are leading away S. Paul. Two heads seem twice repeated, of an extraordinary ordinariness and dullness—which beggars description.

However, the study of portrait never quite died out, but may be traced even in mosaic or miniature, when sculpture was no more. And when the Northern races had got beyond their student-stage in Etruria, Niccola Pisano, Cimabue, and Giotto laid an emphasis on countenances, which Art can never forget, and only neglects at her peril. But in the decadence the face seems to have been studied by the best workmen, to the neglect of drapery and the bodily form. Perhaps men despised the latter, perhaps they had only too good reason to do so, in the degeneracy of Greek and Italian manhood and womanhood. At all events, heads get altogether too big for bodies. The monastic painters at least escaped this failing ; but Byzantine dignity of asceticism is the only honour of the human frame for centuries to come. It is real, but it is mournful ; and it hopelessly limits all representative Art, by narrowing its range of study ; soon reducing it to the repetition of traditional type and pattern ; enforcing no realist study from nature, either for correct form or vigorous action.

The crowded figures are the inheritance of Rome, and are

¹ See Parker, vol. xx. : the Villa Albani reliefs, 2835, 2846 ; also 2854-5-6 and 2860, for late secular work, inferior to the better Christian.

² Parker, 2907, 2909, 2927.

³ 2934-5.

⁴ No. 2935.

derived from the endless triumphal processions of the days of consular or imperial victory. Such subjects are not necessarily fatal to the spirit of Art; and had a truly native and original school of Roman sculpture ever developed itself from the time of the Capitoline Wolf, about the end of the second Punic war, the long victorious pomps might have been treated with beauty and grandeur. There is no doubt that the Italian cavalcades of the middle ages suggested much to the artists of the *renaissance*; and Holbein's mastery of art and play of inventive fancy are well shown in his triumphs of Maximilian, and processional frescoes. But the soul of ancient sculpture was Greek. It was only as panegyrist and flatterer that the conquered Hellenic race decked the triumphs whose wheels themselves had followed. Besides, one triumph must have been very like another, generally speaking. Endless trains of undistinguished swordsmen, and unknown captives, made Art only the record of a spectacle, always more or less dull and sanguinary. Besides, the number of figures in a triumph was overpowering. The spaces allotted for triumphal bas-relief, however large, had always to be crowded. Siegeworks, assaults on fortifications, warlike engines, every kind of military operation, however unmanageable as a subject for sculpture, had to be got in somehow. The Column of Trajan contends wonderfully with these difficulties; but soon after, if not there, the heads begin to be too large, the distracted designer finding these quite indispensable in the eye of his patrons, and feeling less and less sense of responsibility as to legs. There can be little doubt that this universal technical error of the decadence must be associated with the constant necessity of filling spaces with as many figures as possible, since men count heads, and multitudes cannot be represented without them; whereas the eye of almost every spectator wanders carelessly over limbs and extremities, and either fails to observe, or idly condones error.

Another increased difficulty of the triumphal sculptures had its effect at the same time, in that perspectives and distance and figures of diminished size were necessary. In bas-relief,¹ though the Greeks had shown how great depth of space might be expressed by delicate perspective drawing in foreground figures and bodies done in the shallowest relief, aerial perspective is of course impossible, and the only resource is to make figures smaller and cut them more faintly. The results, as in the Nineveh sculptures, in Trajan's reliefs

¹ See the *quadriga* in *Aratio Pentelici*, by Prof. Ruskin, plate xiii. p. 174.

and others, though graphic and valuable as history, are unsatisfactory as art. But the introduction of small figures in bas-relief has special meaning in the Christian tombs. When Our Lord is working the miracles of mercy, the sufferer, or the merely human personages introduced, are almost always of much smaller stature than He : and this distinction is carried out even to the mediæval tombs of Venice.¹ It is insisted on, as has been hinted above, in the great sixth-century mosaics, often with imposing effect, and it may date, as Lord Lindsay observes, from the placing Victories in the hands of statues of the greater gods in Pheidian days.

It seems, indeed, that early in the fifth century, the artistic energies of the Church were transferred almost entirely from sculpture in marble to mosaic. Our present space does not enable us to do justice to Professor Westwood's ivories, though their value is very great, in enabling us to trace the secular or classic decadence, in Constantinople, of Art-work uninspired by the religious fervour of the monk-artists. The secular ivories show a rapid decay of technical skill, when all invention or sense of beauty had long been lost. Their importance as a connected series illustrative of history may be judged of from the fact that we possess, as Professor Westwood says, an unbroken set of carvings from B. C. 980 in Egypt ; and that the ivories partly supply the want of stone monuments during the long period between the third and fourth centuries and the twelfth and thirteenth. The continued succession of imperial and consular diptychs, generally intended as presents between exalted personages in the State, provides an historical series by the best carvers of the time. By its means the student will be best able to gain the difficult habit of distinction between Roman, or late-classical, and Byzantine work ; since the Roman diptychs are not likely to have followed Eastern or ecclesiastical tastes. At the same time, such invaluable works as the great casket of Brescia (in the Biblioteca Quiriniana), the chair of the Duomo of Ravenna, and the Cathedra Apostolica (given by Westwood), show how the Church came to monopolise the arts, by being their only safe depository, and by keeping up the unbroken, though modified order of sacred subjects.

Had any of the great chryselephantine statues been preserved—which might indeed have been the case, had not gold been used so largely in them—the modern study of ivory sculpture might have dated from Pheidias, as all study of marble sculpture virtually must begin from him. This is

¹ *Stones of Venice*, vol. iii. ch. ii.

impossible ; but the value of ivories from the second century may be well summed up in Professor Westwood's own words :—

' Being generally carved in low relief, they partake of the nature both of sculpture and painting. They are thus illustrative of the whole decline and fall of Western art : they are the principal monuments, except the MS. miniatures, in which the artistic hagiology of the East is recorded. They present the most complete picture of Carolingian escape from tradition, and are the most copious commentary on the spiritual and romantic life of the middle ages, which the art of the sculptor has bequeathed to us.'

One or two examples must be referred to ; and any of our readers who may be interested in this subject will find them in Professor Westwood's *Catalogue*, and at South Kensington. Those who are within reach of any large library will find all they need in Gorius's *Thesaurus Veterum Diptychorum*.

First, Professor Westwood gives a woodcut of the diptych (p. 28) of Rufus Probianus, consul A.D. 322—one of the earliest known within the Christian era, and now in the *Kunstammer* at Berlin. Each leaf is divided into two compartments : the consul above, two priests with a tripod altar below on each leaf. He bears a long scroll and a style. The inscription across both tablets above him is 'Rufus Probianus V.C. Vicarius Urbis Romæ.' The technical part of the work may pass. There is a pretty Greek lily-border round the whole. The consul sits with some dignity in a sella cut in fair perspective, though the altar below is wrong. The drapery is altogether good ; the priests are above 6 heads high, one $6\frac{1}{4}$; the faces are not expressionless, and the figures are well enough posed. Such was some of the best work three years before the Council of Nice ; and with it should be compared the great Barberini carving of an emperor (supposed to be Constantius), which Professor Westwood and D'Agincourt both assign at latest to the fourth century. It is an equestrian figure,¹ violently foreshortened, and with all the faults of proportion highly developed. The emperor's seat on horseback is not bad ; but the horse's chest looks quite flaccid, though in the action of rearing. The engravings are no doubt inadequate, and plates on a white margin must always fail to give any of the delicate transparency and clear relief of ivory carving. But the horse is a sad failure when compared with those of Trajan or Antoninus : the hoofs, feet, and hands are all too large, the procession below is confused, the proportions no-

¹ See D'Agincourt, *Sculpt.* pl. iii. fig. 15 ; Gorius, vol. ii. p. 177.

where. Art has given way to pride of state and luxury ; and if this carving really represents Constantius, there is a dismal symbolism in the way in which the *imago clypeata* of Our Lord is squeezed into narrow compass above, to make room for the dull face and clumsy person of the murderer of all his own race,—whose crimes and long search after the life of Julian sealed the fate of the world, by setting the only genius in the Roman empire at deadly variance with the only Faith.

Sir Digby Wyatt has pointed out a curious distinction between Eastern and Western diptychs, that in the latter the consul generally stands, and in the former sits, in his curule chair :

‘In point of art,’ he says, ‘the Eastern are generally better ; but even in them we may trace the antique element as dying out, and being replaced by those features of conventionality, which subsequently asserted an independent style of their own.’

Thus, on the diptych of Anastasius (consul of the East A.D. 517), he is seated between two figures of Rome and Byzantium, and holds the *mappa*, or napkin, to give the signal for the games in the amphitheatre represented below, where men are placed in grated cages to be attacked by bears, though in tolerable safety ; or they are hung up in baskets just beyond the animal’s reach, or are running from one shelter to another, dodging him like Spanish *chulos*. There are also race-horses preparing to start, and a curious and disgusting amusement, which seems to have consisted in seeing men’s noses pinched by large live crabs.¹ However, these games must have been no small improvement on the gladiatorial shows, which were never exhibited at Constantinople, and had been ended at Rome by the martyrdom of S. Telemachus in 404—not the last or least victory of the faith in weakness. We never could make out why Roman and Anglican Calendars alike neglect this great name and deed. We suppose that infallibility does not like to reflect on the habits of Roman Christians of the fifth century ; and that England is occupied with Machutus, Swithun, Valentine, and O Sapientia.

We may close this paper with another quotation from the same authority, with which we quite agree, as to the ivories of the decadence :—

‘In the rigidity of the principal figures, and their unmeaning heads, may be traced the loss of antique skill in depicting human life ; while in the elaborate chair and rich embroideries of the consular robes, foot-stool and chair-cushion, may already be recognised

¹ Gori, i. 280 : ‘Diptychon Leodiense.’

that tendency to florid ornamentation, which forms the basis of the style subsequently famous as Byzantine.'

For 'forms the basis' we should read 'continues to characterise.' Tawdriness is really a fault of the classical decadence, not of the Byzantine renaissance of Art.

With that style, so called, Art became spiritual once more. If there be a soul or spirit of man, his work in Art will be guided by that spirit, and as he is, so will his work be. The civil and military life of the seventh century, Greek and Roman, was broken and gone; the monkhood could not fight; the higher ecclesiastics were blind and angry leaders; the people called on their saints instead of manning quinquereemes and filling up the legions. Nevertheless, a remnant of Christian endurance, and of zeal for teaching in the name of Christ, survived, in obscure provinces and far missions; and the Church, like the typical olive, grew and strengthened in her living bark, though marred and cloven at her core. The monastic spirit was at times narrow, vehement, persistent in error and enmity; but everywhere and incessantly it made for purity, for self-denial, labour and prayer; and in the midst of military disgrace and civic destruction it conquered the destroyers, as Greece had conquered Rome. The arts under their Byzantine form were one of the Church's first gifts to her Gothic converts. The Ascetic artists, one can see, had lost all traditions of drawing; and this indeed led them to emerge from the slough of decadence. They began to draw each other, as the early mosaics of SS. Cosmas and Damianus and the Laurentian MS. seem to prove—in any case they believed so intensely in what they recorded, that they filled Art once more with meaning, were it only as the life's work of men seeking and preaching life everlasting. Technically, they retained the sense of colour, and regained the sense of proportion in decorative spaces. There came back by degrees a certain observation of nature in still life; perhaps, also, a perception of the folds and fall of heavy drapery, such as monk-artists could not help seeing. But their greater works bear the stamp of ascetic power, which makes ill-drawn forms stand manful, or even kinglike, on stiff, distorted limbs, and gives harsh features the stamp of reality, of an earnestness sometimes dreadful, sometimes beautiful, never to be despised. When our architects can think of new modifications like the fourfold basilica and dome, or our painters can parallel the mosaics of Ravenna, or our missions are blessed with effects like those of Methodius, then as artists and clergy we shall

be in a better position for complacent self-comparison with old Byzantium than we are in at present.

Few words involve more meaning than the expression 'Byzantine Art.' They point to the end of classical or Græco-Roman civilisation, and express the dying embers of the Athenian inspiration of beauty. But they imply as surely the earliest sparks of symbolic Christianity; and amid the corruption of a race deeper-fallen from loftier heights than any earth had known before, they point to the imperishable faith, which is the salt of the earth's decay. In one sense, Byzantine Art means classical decadence; but, in a much truer one, it means Christian renaissance in renewed spiritual life, with Greek guidance for the Teutonic races.

ART. V.—THE WORLD OF FICTION.

1. *Iseulte*. By the Author of *Vera*. (Smith and Elder.)
2. *Ralf and Bruno*. By M. BRAMSTON. (Macmillan.)
3. *The Atelier du Lys*. By the Author of *Mlle. Mori*. (Longmans.)

FICTION! We suppose it is not underrating the truth to estimate the readers of fiction in England as outnumbering enormously the readers of fact, or what at any rate passes for fact. It becomes a serious question, what is the mission of fiction, or whether it have a mission at all, or whether it be merely a voluntary self-distraction by means of a mirage, or by watching the phantasmagoria of a magic lantern instead of real life?

There are some, no doubt, with whom this is the case, but we think they are chiefly persons of indolent nature, or else of imagination in a greater degree than energy. In fact, there is an amount of safety in numbers. Far less impression is created by a whole succession of novels, one driving out the other, than was made when they were very few and far between, were read over and over again, and so discussed as to become realities to their students. What is only glanced over to fill up an idle moment cannot gain a very permanent hold on the mind.

Cannot, we say; yet who can tell? What wonders of unconscious cerebration and dormant memory are now and then

disclosed, making us doubt whether every thought that passes over our minds is not, in some strange manner, photographed there, as it were, and for ever! No one can tell how much or how little even of what we wish to remember or forget will recur to us in actual remembrance or in dreams. We have, in truth, a very limited power over our own memories. Surely this should make us cautious as to haphazard reading, or causing to be read, such topics as may leave some blot, or some haunting terror or evil dream.

It has always struck us that some of the Welsh triads, intended for the guidance of the bards, convey some of the most perfect canons of criticism of all imaginative literature that we ever met with. The three primary requisites of genius—

An eye that can see nature,
A heart that can feel nature,
A resolution that dares follow nature.

The three final intentions of literature—

Increase of goodness,
Increase of understanding,
Increase of delight.

The three properties of a just imagination—

What may be,
What ought to be,
What is seemly to be.

The three advantages of poetry—

The praise of goodness,
The memory of what is remarkable,
The invigoration of the affections.

The three things to be avoided—

The mean, the obscure, the extravagant.

Whatever bard, ancient or modern, drew up these rules, had a clear conception of the lawful aims and requisites of all imaginative work. But we are afraid he would fall under the withering censure of 'goody,' wherewith it has become the fashion to condemn whatever too palpably tends to the first of the 'three final intentions.'

It is worth considering what is really 'goody.' We believe the world means by it all checks or reproofs, 'in season or out of season,' and we are willing to allow that it does apply to those out of season. The sugared cup is goody, so soon

as the taste of the medicine is discovered; and as the child turns from the story so soon as it finds that '*The visit to the gold-fields*' is simply a lesson on wheat-growing, threshing, &c., so the grown-up person is disgusted when two pages of story prove the shoeing-horn to a dozen of sermon. Or, again, the goody story is constructed on the renowned principle of the boy who said he didn't care, and was tossed by a bull. There everything is made to illustrate the principle, whatever it may be; poetical justice is made a far more unerring Nemesis than is justified by real life, and the principal characters improve the incidents in set language that would drive one frantic if addressed to oneself.

Reaction has made it an absolute boast and praise when a story is devoid of moral. It has nearly become praiseworthy to go to the contrary extreme and make it immoral; and there are many who think, in a lazy kind of way, that it is a sort of impertinent intrusion on their idleness and vacancy to infuse any element of improvement into the draught, whether soporific or exciting. They dread, above all, 'a novel with a purpose,' and we quite agree with them, if the art of the novel be sacrificed to its purpose. The effect is then unfortunate, since the book is primarily read for amusement's sake, and that which spoils our amusement naturally incurs dislike.

How then should a novel tend to 'increase of goodness' without being obnoxiously goody? Is it not by presenting portraits of nobleness ('praise of goodness' as the triad calls this), such as may awake an enthusiasm and longing to imitate them? Hero-worship can and ought to find plenty of food in the noble army of martyrs and the rolls of history, but the truthful records of these are often so brief, and sometimes so dry, as to require a good deal of imagination to dress them up—more than some people are capable of. Indeed, even among the educated, some lack the power of heeding or caring for the past. Epaminondas and Gustavus Adolphus seem to them alike mere names, alien to themselves, and neither Leuctra nor Lützen is capable of thrilling their hearts. Yet these same people can thoroughly admire and feel with an Adam Bede or an Anne O'Flaherty, because they are brought nearer to themselves and made real to them, and belong comparatively to their own time and circumstances, so that their veneration can be fed without trouble to their imagination. Probably *Clarissa Harlowe* was the first attempt in this line, and a really successful one, for hers is the nobility of nature that triumphs over circumstance. In his attempt at masculine perfection, Richardson seems to us in these days to have been simply

priggish and ridiculous, but *Sir Charles Grandison* produced a real impression for good in his own day. Jeanie Deans is the next figure we can think of, who is prominent for goodness without goodness; and to come to more 'modern instances,' we may mention 'Will,' in Miss Rosa Carey's novel of *Wood and Married*, and 'Garton Ord,' in her still more beautiful one of *Robert Ord's Atonement*. Neither of them is a moral *Monte-Cristo*, never weak, never tempted, able to do everything with a touch. One is a crippled, broken-down, rheumatic clergyman, with a sharp temper under restraint; the other a blundering awkward youth, a failure and a burden, yet so sweet, so humble, so good and simple as to win our hearts with a sense of pathetic beauty, so that both leave a strong feeling of 'goodness' standing above everything.

We believe this is the best thing that can be derived from a novel. *I Promessi Sposi* leaves that sense; so does *Sybil*, so does Miss Wilford's *Dominie Freylinghausen*, so does George MacDonald's *St. George and St. Michael*; to which, in spite of some blemishes, we owe a debt of gratitude for setting before us the grand old Marquess of Worcester, the most perfect type of the true Christian cavalier. To bring a glow to the heart and a light to the eye by the recollection of some heroic figure, whether wholly imaginary, or a real character brought into full illumination, seems to us one of the best objects of romance—a higher one than even the working out of a sound principle, because persons (even ideal ones) warm the heart as abstract morals can hardly do.

The beauty of virtue and truth, and all other great qualities, should be shown without forcing the course of events so as to bring them success. 'Resolution to follow nature' may have to be exerted in the letting the probable take its course, even if the good is not to be rewarded, and yet binding sympathy and affection to unrequited virtue. Filial affection wins its cause in *Cordelia*, even though we see her dead in her father's arms. The very same events may be told in two such contrary ways, that one may excite all that is good, the other all that is evil in the reader. For instance, the story of Lancelot and Guenever was '*Galeotto*' to Paolo and Francesca. It is one of the most solemn and beautiful teachings in Sir Thomas Malory and in Tennyson. The Italian *Mercatante di Venezia* is (we are told) a licentious story. Shakspeare has made it a pure and noble picture of friendship and self-devotion. Instances might be multiplied by hundreds, showing in what sense 'to the pure all things are pure'—a saying much abused now-a-days. People seem to

think that 'the pure' means those who have not much opportunity of going astray, and that 'all things are pure' signifies that they may with impunity turn from the grossest evidence in a *cause célèbre* to the same vices scarcely veiled in an imaginary work; whereas what it seems to us to mean is that the pure mind only contemplates and assimilates the pure and noble in the past and present. Where one man sees a glorious landscape, another will only see a dead rat in the reeds, and will insist on dragging it out for everybody else to smell, because forsooth the rat is as real as the sunshine on the river, and therefore as worthy of contemplation.

To see and describe nature truly, but so as to bring out the morals of Providence and the workings of good and evil, and to make the reader feel the continual victory of the right, even through outward failure, is one of the highest aims of the highest art. For this the alembic of the writer's own mind and eye is needed. Somewhere in *Modern Painters*, the same mountain-castle is given from the same point of view in a photograph and a sketch. In the former the severe foreshortening conceals the windings of the path that leads up through the vineyards; in the second, it is a fascinating stair hewn out in the rock, with battlemented parapets, which were lost in the severe perspective of the same painting. Is not this one legitimate use of an imaginary tale of an historical period? There is a sermon of Bishop Charles Wordsworth, preached at Winchester College, condemning historical romance as being in danger of slandering those gone into an unseen world, where we shall meet them. It may be that this is a real objection to distorted or party-spirited representations, or to such as, for the sake of the story, add incidents which are a stain on the individuals. Perhaps the readiest case in point is Goethe's introduction of Clärchen in *Egmont*, entirely contrary to history. Others have maligned an historical character from ignorance or misreading, as Shakspeare did by the Maid of Orleans, and as Scott did in some degree both by King René and Charles the Bold, and certainly the more we read, the more we feel our own incompetence to judge the men and women of the past.

But still it seems to us perfectly fair and legitimate to take some personage of old time, and dress him up according to our lights, putting him in action so as to be able to develop all that we can collect. The 'Federigo Borromeo' of Manzoni, Schiller's 'Wallenstein,' Scott's 'Louis XI.,' Lord Lytton's 'Rienzi,' Bungenauer's 'Rabaut,' are instances of what we mean, and so is George Eliot's 'Savonarola' in some degree,

though she fails from her incapacity to understand a saint and a martyr. It ought to be honest work, developing from the rule and measure laid down by competent authorities, and aim at moulding a statue-like life from the real outlines. Nor would the scruple we alluded to apply to setting a fancied character to live, move, and speak in some period according to what we know must have been the spirit of the times and manners and customs. *The Last Days of Pompeii*, the earlier chapters of Charles Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth*, the description of Florence in *Romola*, and much of *Westward Ho!* are all examples of those vivid picturings of manners, scenery, and habits of thought of which history can only give the bare foundation. They really fulfil the Welsh canons above cited, both as being for 'increase of understanding' and 'the memory of what is remarkable.'

The failures in such attempts are chiefly from either want of grasp to understand the times, want of sufficient knowledge to avoid mistakes, strong party-spirit, or the desire to force in more instruction, historical or moral, than the story will bear. If a story is to be a story, it must not be dramatised history, though here and there we can point to successes even in this line, such as Sir Francis Palgrave's *Merchant and Friar*, Miss Manning's *Mary Powell and Margaret Roper*, and Bungenaer's *Trois Sermons sous Louis Quinze*, all of which are admirable studies of character and manners, though scarcely professing to be independent stories. The books, of which the *Schonberg Cotta Family* was the first, aim at this line, but often fail, because an autobiography requires more of the spirit of the time than a person of an after generation can possess, and thus the meditations of early Christian, and Anglo-Saxon nun, German Mädchen, perplexed little Puritan, and auditor of John Wesley, all smack alike of the lady of the nineteenth century who has accepted an amount of liberal-mindedness that would have horrified most of them.

As to the failures in grasp and knowledge, every one makes them, and other generations find it out, as we have done by even *Ivanhoe*, and as those who were imbued with a catholic spirit always did by *Hypatia*, which the author considered the most likely to live of all his works. Most historical romance is apt to be like Paul Veronese's pictures, contemporary portraiture with more or less of ancient costume. Scott, in spite of all cavils, the great master of the art, further held that fact might be sacrificed to the exigencies of romance, and that it was art to put *telling* occasions in juxtaposition, and annihilate inconvenient years, or awkward facts—to let 'Ulrica' live from

the Conquest till the Third Crusade, and make poor 'Margaret of Anjou' intrigue after her death. Criticism will allow no such liberties now, when to put forth a book is to set up a target with some curiosity to see what blots will be hit by those whose office it is to find the vulnerable spots. No doubt it has made the work much more difficult, though we believe, on the other hand, that no one writes anything worth reading without a spontaneous impulse independent of criticism.

One more point in the historical novel should be mentioned as needful to make it worthy, namely, that it should only deal with such things as deserve to be dwelt on and brought before the mind. Those passages of history which are only dark shadows of foulness and evil ought never to be dragged into light and dissected. That a Regent Orleans or a Louis XV. existed is no reason for bringing their vices prominently before the mind's eye. Even punishment does not set the matter right for the minds of readers, and readers cannot be as if they had never even in imagination tasted garbage.

The right sort of historical novel is, then, that which brings into clear detail and life some period, with appreciation both of character and of the spirit of the time, making, as far as possible, living beings of those who might otherwise be mere names. If it can bring any noble figure into full relief or cast a clearer light on some period not understood, it becomes doubly valuable, but in the main, if it be a clear, candid, and spirited delineation of the past, it is well worth having.

And here we must say a good word for an old friend of our youth, G. P. R. James. He overwrote himself, and finally degenerated into a haberdashery sort of detail; his regular opening with the two travellers became a by-word, and at the best, he had only talent, not genius. But his history was correct, his tone pure and gentlemanlike, and his books are safe and instructive as well as entertaining. We should like to see some of the best revived, such as *Philip Augustus*, *Mary of Burgundy*, or *Henry of Guise*.

There is also the romance—*pur et simple*—with no erudition in it, no costume except armour and white samite, and the manners those of ideal chivalry. To increase of knowledge the romance makes little or no pretensions, but to increase of delight, and even to increase of goodness, it surely tends when of the true sort. It belongs indeed to the realm of poetry. It is as it were only accident that we have it in prose. The *Morte d'Arthur* and the *Faery Queene* are surely akin as much as are the *Talisman* and *Lay of the Last Minstrel*. Indeed we fancy that 'Wat Tinlin' and 'William

of Deloraine' are much more true to nature than 'Sir Kenneth' and 'Edith Plantagenet.' The mission of romance is, to carry us along in a dreamlike mood of wonder, sympathy and pity, or admiration, while there is often a certain under-current of feeling or allusion, often half allegory, and the broad lights and shades of the characters of the personages tend to excite enthusiasm for the true, the pure, the brave and faithful, even in impossible circumstances.

Such bright, simple tales, where all the men are brave and all the women virtuous, where generosity and constancy are taken for granted, and gallant deeds of self-devotion are the staple subject, are like sweets to the unsophisticated palate. They may cloy if too much indulged in, but all such substance as there is in them is wholesome fare. It is a pity when we grow past them, and it is a greater pity not to have imagination enough to get up an interest in what is manifestly impossible.

Romance is at a discount now. Common sense is reigning, and we are required to look on everything material, however loathsome or hideous, with microscopic eyes, unweakened by any illusions. Otherwise we cannot be practical. Times are changed, for there have been days when the sense of fighting out the daily struggle in the spirit ascribed to the knight of romance imparted a real access of vigour and constancy. We have heard the legend of Shakspeare, when forced to act as a butcher, working himself up with poetry to feel like a Greek hero performing a sacrifice. Poor Charles VIII. learnt truth and honour in the court of Louis XI. from Amadis de Gaul, Alexander fed upon *Homer*, and Napoleon I. upon *Ossian*—Macpherson's *Ossian*, done into Italian—a strange fact, one would exclaim, but how perfectly consistent with his own famous maxim that 'it is the imagination that governs the world.' We cannot claim him for a favourable specimen either of romance or its effects, but a certain amount of idealism and poetry is an ingredient in heroic natures, witness Wolfe's reading Gray's *Elegy* below the heights of Abraham, and our Peninsular soldiers the *Lady of the Lake*. Don Quixote's error was his distortion of fancy, in beholding Pentapolin of the naked arm in a harmless sheep, and an oppressed captive in a galley-slave; but the same knight-errantry of spirit, finding its giants in sin, and its dragons in its own tempers, has infinitely invigorated some men and many women. Nay, this imaginative power and religious faith do blend together in a marvellous manner. It is a reality that every resistance of evil in ourselves or others is a stroke in

the battle by the soldiers who go forth in white linen on white horses, following that Captain, Who is Faithful and True. Theirs is the highest and most real romance of all.

'Wash thee, and watch thine armour, as of old,
The champions vow'd of Truth and Purity,
Ere the bright mantle might their limbs enfold,
Or spear of theirs in knightly combat vie.
Hence summer nights outwatched the dawn on high,
And found the time too short for busy dreams—
Pageants of airy prowess drawing nigh—
And Fame far hovering with immortal beams,
And more than prowess theirs, and more than fame ;
No dream, but an abiding consciousness,
Of an approving God, a righteous aim,
An arm outstretched to guide them and to bless,
Firm as steel bows for angel's warfare bent,
They went abroad not knowing where they went.'¹

Critics may well tell us that the age of chivalry never existed ! It is the golden age of Christian heroism, a borderland of allegory and reality, from which many a youth has brought sentiments of honour, truth, and loyalty, which he might otherwise have failed to develop even from the eternal fountains of all good. It is quite true the Christian code contains all these, but the ideal standard of the *preux chevalier* presents them in a form which catches the imagination and leads to imitation by those whom the deeper and higher motives have not yet reached.

As a man's standard is, so will he in a measure be himself ; and when romance, as in France and Italy, was licentious and false, such a character as Francis I. was its manifestation in real life. And when the aims and principles of the generality are low, the romance which exaggerates them degenerates into extravagance, licence, or sentimentalism. The *Faery Queene* is as great a contrast to *Orlando Furioso* as are Raleigh and Sidney to the Medici and Farnesi. The *Grand Cyrus* answered well to the pompous court of Louis XIV. *Télémaque* had in it the germs of higher and better things ; and, on the other side of the Channel, *Gulliver* reflected the satyr-like sneering foulness of his time. When purer times were restored such tales as the *Castle of Otranto*, the *Mysteries of Udolpho*, and *The One-Handed Monk*, brought back the innocent, though at that time foolish, romance, such as Catherine Morland meant when she terrified Miss Tylney by communicating in a mysterious tone : 'I hear something very dreadful

¹ Keble.

is coming out in London.' The outward symbols of those times are the modern stucco castle and abbey where ancient castle and abbey never existed, with crenellated parapets to hide the gutters, corner turrets that nobody could get into, and loopholes whence nobody could shoot. Yet this school—like nothing in heaven or earth—where Madrid is on the sea coast, where waxen images act ghosts, and castles have enormous vaults, tenanted by masked villains *ad libitum*, was the delight of the generation whose resistance to all the manifold forms of evil and defiance in France was the grand act of Christian chivalry of the century.

And so from the forge of German patriotism were struck forth bright sparks in those charming romances of Fouqué, the *Zauberring* and *Thiodolf*, so perfect as mere romances; while his *Undine*, *Sintram*, and *Die Beiden Hauptleute* strike the higher chord where romance acquires something of the deeper tone of parable. Goethe, who, with all his powers, had no sense of noble love for woman or for country, wrote no romance. The chief work of his youth was the parent of the sentimental suicidal novel; the work of his highest genius is the victory of the tempter over weak man and erring woman. Is it not significant of that sordid spirit of unbelief so fearfully described in *German Home Life* that Fouqué is never read and utterly despised in his native land?

We are glad that pure romance has not even now died out among us. George Mac Donald often gives us the thoughtful, half allegorical romance, such as *Phantastes*, or the *Princess and the Goblin*; and there is a charming story of Miss Smedley's, too little known, called *Nina, or the Silver Swan*, where maiden and knight alike belong to the highest and tenderest realms of fancy. And how popular among us are translations of Jules Verne, the Münchhausen of modern science and discovery, going always a little beyond the possible, yet in so circumstantial and philosophical a manner, that whether he takes us round the moon, to the bottom of the sea, or the centre of the earth, we still feel ourselves at home with his preternaturally cool Englishmen, brilliant Frenchmen, and 'ready, aye ready' Yankees. These all have the most needful element of romance in being pure and high-minded; the heroes never fail in the essential qualities of truth, honour, generosity, and self-devotion, and the hand of a reverent believer is traceable wherever he comes for a moment in contact with deeper things.

We pass on to the novel proper, whose mission professes to be to paint nature, whether in the novel of recent or contempo-

rary history, the controversial novel, the indignation novel, the religious novel, the descriptive novel, the novel of common life, with or without a purpose, moral or immoral.

By novels of recent history we mean those written without a sense of archaism, though not always concerning the writer's own generation. *Waverley* and *Rob Roy* were such to Scott, who had actually seen the manners and had gleaned the traditions from eye-witnesses. Thackeray's *Esmond* is the result of a careful study of language and manners, but the *Bride of Lammermuir* came as naturally to Scott as if the Master had been his next-door neighbour. Thus we class the many stories of the times of the first French Revolution, past, indeed, but into the perfect, rather than the pluperfect tense. If we represent French people with the same amount of truth as they show in delineating us English, we must afford them a good deal of amusement, for our authors have for many years been fond of dealing with the subject. Henry Kingsley's *Mademoiselle Mathilde* gives us scenes we cannot forget—the sack of the asylum, the mutiny at Nancy, and the noyade at Nantes, with the noble old priest standing, Gospel in hand, to the last, and dying with the words on his tongue: 'Old things have passed away, all things have become new!' The beauty of the book is more in its isolated scenes than in the whole, and it is hard to forgive the having deprived a real person like Adèle of her heroism, and made her selfish and foolish to suit the purposes of the story. Sarah Tytler's *Citoyenne Jacqueline* deals cleverly with some aspects of the time. The young peasant-deputy, Joaquille, made into a dandy by his Paris life, is a good portrait, and there is a picture of the interior of the prisons, perfectly borne out by the memoirs of the time, but somehow there is a sense that the book is written from the outside.

On the Edge of the Storm depicts the earlier days of the Revolution as seen in the country château, sacked by the neighbouring townspeople. This is, however, more a study of a few characters than a real picture of the Revolution, such as the same author has given us in the *Atelier du Lys*, evidently the result of many years' study and reflection and a wonderfully intimate knowledge of French character. The author's forte is in quaint old ladies full of character, and Mademoiselle de St. Aignan is a wonderfully clever picture of the lively woman, taking up the Revolution half as fashion, half from native good sense, and yet as exclusively prejudiced as ever on the point of birth and breeding, forgiving everything to De Pelven, the villain (and a consummate villain he is too),

because he cannot help being a well-born, well-bred, agreeable man. Then there is the really noble and pathetic figure of the Swiss, Balmat, who has sacrificed everything to study painting at Paris under David, and lives on through the Reign of Terror, pure, innocent, simple, and devoted to his art. He is no colourist, nor can he rise to the hard, rigid, classical style of David. He can only achieve a modest, half-despised success in his own line of landscape and still life, and even that comes too late to save him from dying of his privations after having been the good genius of the book. There is also a beautiful sketch of a priest, who has consented for a while to fly, but returns to do his duty among his flock, suffers agonies from his timidity as long as he is at large, but when taken at last rejoices, and is calm and resolute as well as happy.

The *atelier* which gives the book its name is a studio within the Louvre, which was, during the Republic, we here find, divided among artists and their pupils, and where David worked according to his notions of high classic art, and his pupils raved about him, and walked about in Greek costume. We have in these volumes gained an accurate picture of several phases of that strange shifting scene, and the plot on which the tale is constructed is an interesting one, in full accordance with the time.

Yet we think it a pity that there is so much resemblance to the plot of *Denise*, where again we have a marriage and a separation immediately after, the young couple only coming to an understanding at the end. *Denise* is, however, a descriptive, not an historical romance, and has many fresh and charming pictures of the country about Hyères.

Description and history are both united in *Mademoiselle Mori*, which has come to be a handbook for sight-seers in Rome, and will remain a brilliant record of various aspects of life at Rome in the year of Revolutions, when hope rose high and was quashed by French intervention. All these three books contain work of a very high order, of a kind of miniature detail and finish, studied and truthful in every part. Almost every character is either an individual portrait or the type of a class, and perhaps the very elaboration prevents individual figures from standing out as prominently as perfect art would require.

The Franco-German war has its share already of tales. *The Parisians*, unhappily unfinished, is in Lord Lytton's best style of what may be called representative writing. Every character stands for a class. There is the proud, honourable,

narrow Breton noble, dipped in Paris society, and getting soiled by its vices, but not irremediably ; there are his two kinsmen, one the true, bright, gay, brave French noble of the old kind, the other the saintly and gallant 'son of the crusaders,' of the Montalembert pattern ; there is the spoilt, sensual, sentimental young poet, a degenerate copy of Camille Desmoulins ; there is the speculator, the gambler in shares, the special product of the Empire ; there are the *ouvriers*, that terrible element in modern Paris ; and there is the arch-plotter, a sort of Rochefort, but in whom it is less easy to believe than in the rest of the characters. Another story, whose chief interest lies in that unhappy period, is *Iseulte*, by the author of *Vera*. It begins unsatisfactorily, and we think we are falling into the threadbare style of the intriguing priest getting the innocent girl into a convent, but suddenly we find ourselves breathing a fresh air when we are taken to the mountain château, whose master is one of the school of Lacordaire, and where the gradual refinement of Iseulte's nature is well brought out in the midst of amusing sketches of the development of a new French watering-place on the site of some old Roman baths. Iseulte, be it understood, is an unhappy wife, married without her own volition to a man whom it is impossible to love or esteem, and who does not wish to be troubled with her, so that she has lived apart from him even from the first. In her mountain home, she meets Guy de Lussarques, the first man who stirs her affections, and this brings her to a sense of the duty and necessity of returning to her husband.

He is prefect of the city of Velun, in Burgundy, where she arrives to find him severely hurt by an accident, and she has just nursed him into recovery when the Prussians are upon them, and he is one of those unfortunate officials who were forced to make a journey on the engine of the train used for transport, as a pledge of security for the invaders. Fatigue and exposure cause his death, and Iseulte immediately after sets forth to join her sister in her convent. Her way lies through a village whence she can make no further progress, and is forced to wait while the place is harried, first, by the Garibaldians, and then by the Prussians. Then it is that a most touching and noble scene ensues, when two German soldiers having been shot, each death is to be punished by that of six men, chosen by lot, from among the villagers. The first name is that of the Curé, who has been the blessing of the parish through all its sufferings, and had refused to be excluded from the fatal urn. Two unmarried men give them-

selves in the stead of two fathers of large families, and the Curé leads the way to the *place*.

'The Curé's voice rose sweet and clear as if at a festival. "*Sursum corda*." A Jewish girl gives a malignant laugh, and Iseulte kneeling in the porch is impelled to make response, "*Habemus ad Dominum*."

"*Gratias agimus Deo*"—the rest is drowned in the rattle of the musketry.'

Iseulte, after nearly perishing at the hands of her own people as a Prussian spy, is rescued by her lover, whom she is now free to marry, and we leave this very striking book with a sense of gladness and peace.

One more story of this war must be mentioned—Miss Bramston's *Ralph and Bruno*—a contrast between the English and French character, which would have been more probable if the heroes had not both been half of each nation. The latter, a brave young dreamer, of high aspiration but unanchored faith, is a very touching sketch, only indeed such a sketch as a feminine hand can draw, and yet worthy of note as a record of the character of the times.

We pass on to the controversial novel—a thing of bad name, and often deservedly. It is always, on a longer scale, a likeness of the old dialogue in Italian churches of the *avvocato di Dio* and the *avvocato del Diavolo*, and thus is like playing at chess against yourself. It is impossible to make the *avvocato del Diavolo* so much in earnest or so dangerous as he would be in real life, and yet the other *avvocato* is apt to come out so priggish as to throw the sympathy on the wrong side. We hardly know of any of note enough to mention; most are on the Romish controversy, and they generally betray profound ignorance on the subject, and of the Roman Catholic point of view. They are not good weapons, for nobody can understand the workings of a religion who has not professed it; and if there be any catastrophe at all, it can hardly be the natural product of the argument, and the principle of persecution must needs rule the plot, even though the tale be in condemnation of persecution.

Before passing from this subject we must, however, mention a novel of the early years of this century, *Rosanne*, by Letitia Hawkins; the ability and instructiveness of which so much impressed us that we should like to see the earlier half reprinted. We can only sketch the outline from memory, but we believe it was as follows: Rosanne is the daughter of a man of much learning and culture, named Bellarmine, who,

after a youth of dissipation, adopts the atheistical ideas then current in the French fashion, and carries off his little motherless girl to France to bring her up on the Rousseau system, totally free from superstition. He purchases one of the châteaux left vacant in the revolution; obtains as a governess Mademoiselle Cossart, a Frenchwoman of the period, fat, gourmande, good-natured, vain, and voluble on her intended great work on the perfectibility of human nature. Rosanne, a fine, healthy, happy creature, is chiefly taught by her father, all her books being carefully weeded of anything that could lead to 'superstition,' and when, as she becomes acquainted with history, religion occurs as a cause of change and war, it is contemptuously explained to be a manifestation of human weakness and folly. But when the child looks up to the stars and asks how they came there, she is coughed down with the same look that had taught her the rules of decorum, so that she imagined that it was ill-bred to mention the heavenly bodies. We are afraid the Bellarmine of the present day would only point to them as parts of the self-acting mechanism of nature.

Very striking is the description of how poor Rosanne, when she was about fifteen or sixteen, knew that something was persistently kept from her and became conscious of a void, and began to feel and yearn, 'like infants crying for the light.' Her first hint comes, we think, when she is laid up with some infectious disorder. Her father and governess both being mortally frightened, shut themselves up in opposite ends of the house, each thinking the other is attending to her, and the servants follow their example. A good, simple countrywoman is sent in to nurse her, and Rosanne seeing her pray, soon breaks out in the question she is always asking: 'What, and why?' She learns little, however. The woman, living when religion was proscribed in France, and fancying her patient's ignorance Protestantism, will not answer questions and hides her devotions when she finds them observed, but Rosanne has gained the name of *le bon Dieu*, and knows that He is addressed with reverence, though unseen, and that the woman who so addresses Him is kind, calm, content, and good beyond all she has known.

She questions her governess on *le bon Dieu*, and in an unguarded moment gets answered; 'The Supreme Being,' though the next instant, seeing what a revelation these words were to the girl, mademoiselle refuses to teach her any more 'superstition,' and thereby opens to her the knowledge that the dreadful folly whence she was so carefully guarded was

that which concerned the 'Supreme Being' to whom Nanette spoke.

A struggling, very beautiful prayer to the unknown Supreme Being follows, and then fresh rays break in. There is an alarm of ghosts in the château, and mademoiselle is frightened out of her wits, and out of all power of parrying her pupil's questions: '*Revenant?* Where does it *revenir* from?'

'From the grave, to be sure.' 'From the grave? What comes back from the grave?' 'The spirit of course.'

So, though the ghost is proved to be a mischievous boy, Rosanne has learnt the *non omnis moriar*, and has found besides that, beneath all mademoiselle's outward profession of superiority to all delusions, there is an undercurrent of such belief as that of the devils perhaps, but still an ingrain belief in the unseen. This is confirmed again, in a storm, in a little boat, when mademoiselle went down on her knees and prayed to the saints as loud as any of the frightened boatmen.

Rosanne has been secluded from all society, but she hears of an English lady, widow of a Frenchman, who had come to the next château. She actually walks thither, dragging her unwilling governess with her, and supplicates the lady 'to teach her superstition.' Even when she finds out some approach to what is meant, the lady, a pretty, silly butterfly, has never learnt more than the outside, and has forgotten or confused that, but her five-years-old child, taught by a good old English nurse, is brought in, and made to rehearse her small acquirements. From the beginning of the Creed Rosanne gathers something. The end, in poor little Lisette's lisplings, is incomprehensible, but she gains the Lord's Prayer, she hears the child say 'Grace,' and she is shown a Bible, when she electrifies madame by her observations: 'This is poetry; this is something like Rochefoucauld's maxims;' while, on the other hand, the sight of the first chapter of Isaiah only reminds madame of the new pelisse she spoilt on an Advent Sunday.

Nurse will not hear of lending the precious Bible, but Rosanne, after a great effort, obtains her mother's old Bible and Prayer-Book, and thenceforth her way is comparatively clear.

Being in possession of a few awkward secrets of mademoiselle's, she can ensure her silence till, just as her untaught conscience is enlightened enough to doubt the rectitude of concealment, an accident reveals the state of things to her father, and there is a terrible storm, when Bellarmine has the

mortification of finding that the recent development of fine qualities he had thought due to his system was really founded on the hated 'superstition.' Rosanne is very firm. 'She cannot *unthink*,' she says; 'she cannot unbelieve again.' She is sent off to her own apartments, till a sudden illness of her father brings them together, and he is forced to depend on her, preserving an angry silence. Finally, by a mistake in a draught of medicine, he all but poisons her, and in the height of her danger, grants her wish to see her English friends, so that she becomes free to enjoy all that she can learn from little Lisette and from the good old nurse, as she slowly recovers.

Here the book ought to have ended. The latter part, after she is taken to England, is very inferior, but the working out of Rosanne's faith in her girlhood has always seemed to us a remarkable and beautiful study, though, quoting only from memory, we have not done justice to it.

The political novel is not often really interesting, and it has this great disadvantage artistically, that it must be either personal or impossible, when it professes to deal with cabinets. Living men, under a shallow disguise, do not seem to us fair subjects.

The indignation novel has sometimes been a very effective influence; coming generally just as attention is getting turned towards some abuse, it concentrates the public feeling on some imaginary case under oppression, sometimes a little exaggerated, but often only too true, and really assists in directing the current of public opinion. Mrs. Trollope did this by the abuses in the old factory system; Mrs. Beecher Stowe by slavery; Dickens succeeded best of all, not only through his vivid descriptions, but by those proverbial names, such as Dotheboys Hall, Bumble, Mrs. Gamp, the Circumlocution Office, all which remain in the language as monuments of an evil shown up and conquered. Other novels, written with the same object, have failed in comparison, partly because of weakness or exaggeration, or because the writers' indignation is misplaced. It is curious that the weapon should almost uniformly become blunt when misapplied.

Perhaps one of the most curious bits of writing of our day was Trollope's *Warden*, a remarkable study of the modern process of reform. The corrupt state of things is acknowledged, and the reformer is blustering and disagreeable in his honest desire to overthrow abuses, but the gentle old Warden, who is ousted by his efforts, is one of Mr. Trollope's few really beautiful characters. There used now and then to be a high

and beautiful character in this author's books, sometimes a really deep thought, as in the story where the young man deteriorates from the time when, going full of religious aspiration to the Holy Land, all is swept away by a frivolous sight-seeing girl, who lowers the tone of his mind for ever. Again, there is much in the retribution for Mrs. Grantley's mammon-worship striking her through that one parting whisper of her daughter leaving home as a bride, 'Take care how my dress is packed up,' when the mother is yearning for some warm farewell. Somehow this punishment has always put us in mind of that legendary gnat who avenged on the great conqueror all his crimes by one little sting in his ear. Shall we venture to express a regret that the author has not lately given us his higher and better side, but has written on the level of the religion and morality of the world around him, the average requirements of the British Lion and *The Times*? There is no vice brought forward to be gloated over; he admires all the gentlemanlike and ladylike virtues, and awakes our sympathy for them, but he has no notion of them running too far. Religion is to be just enough to be respectable upon, not to make people uncomfortable or put them out of their way, so daily services are more than once treated as ridiculous, novels are brought forward as Sunday reading, and when refractory parents are to be tamed, it is done by not eating minced veal at luncheon on a Friday.

It may be said that his are photographs of actual life, and that such things happen. It is quite true, but it is also true that there is a high, deep, and noble side to life, which we grieve to say we miss more and more from Mr. Trollope's novels, till in *Phineas Finn*, there is really but one religious man, and he is made detestable.

Such figures as Lady Lufton, Mr. and Mrs. Robarts, Archdeacon and Mrs. Grantley, and others which will readily occur, are well worth preserving, but in general it is rather his scenes than his characters that we think of. They are wanting in that zest and backbone which is given by having some purpose beyond getting on in life, or being married to the right person. There is a tedium in continually dwelling on secondary motives. We should soon get tired of a whole gallery of Frith's racing and railway scenes, and long for a face with something nobler in it, and happily there are many living countenances with the impress of eternity on the brow and eyes, and sweetness and steadfastness on the lips; but those who copy only the lower and more commonplace type, will miss the higher one.

The descriptive novel tries the writer's art. It may be only the traveller's own diary put into narrative, with a few feeble attempts at conversation and a wedding at the end. Or it may be a series of admirable pictures around living actors who identify themselves with the scene, as in that piteous but beautiful book, *Dr. Antonio*, in *Transformations* or in *Mademoiselle Mori*. Great vigour is required to make the story strong enough to carry the descriptions and not be weighed down by them. Some of our recent writers have given us very charming French pictures, such as the *Village on the Cliff*, *Unawares*, the *Hôtel du Petit St. Jean*, and *In the Camargue*, a peculiarly beautiful story of the herdsmen of the wild district in the South of France so called. These are all studies of costume, manners, and scenery, necessarily external, but answering their purpose to outsiders very well and gracefully, and striking the deeper chords, without which there can be no true music.

We were going to pronounce the comic novel the lowest form of the art, when it struck us that the great ironical tragedy of Don Quixote might by some be called a comic romance. Its drollery has such a depth below it, its laughter is so near akin to tears, its picture of the lofty spirit bewildered in its own dreams, and wasting its efforts on delusions, is so sadly true in its hidden meaning that its motto might be 'Even in laughter the heart is sad.' The very contrast gives force to the witticisms and ludicrous adventures, and for this reason it is the only specimen of what is called the comic novel that is ever fresh and new. Others, which deal only with the absurdities of their own time, pass into oblivion. The next generation reads them, wondering what their parents found so delightful in them, and sometimes shocked at their coarseness; and, except for a few jokes and stories which survive in the 'Joe Miller' repertory, they become mere names and authorities for the antiquarian. So has it been with *Eulenspiegel*, *Rabelais*, *Gulliver*, and many another of later times. These three indeed were great satires, written not so much in mirth, as in bitterness of spirit. Those that were merely fun, froth, and exuberance of drollery, have not had so long a life. Nay, it is only in the nature of man to produce one such book of real brilliancy and *abandon* of drollery and humour. Those that follow are only fainter reflections, unless he strike out a new and deeper line, where the mirth only plays an occasional part. Marryat's best novel was his first, *Peter Simple*, where the drollery of the cockpit and the wonderful comicality of the boatswain, Mr. Chucks (ultimately Count

Shucksen), the humours of Portsdown Hill fair, and the fun of the Dignity ball, are set indeed in a wretchedly weak plot, but are backed by real naval adventures of the deepest interest, true episodes of those days of heroism, the great war. The escape from Verdun, the hurricane, and the exploits of the 'Rattlesnake' are worthy to rank with any scenes of adventure that we ever met with. But Marryat had exhausted his best stories and spontaneous wit in this his first novel, and his later ones are all feeble and forced beside it. Charles Lever again never equalled *Harry Lorrequer* in military comedy, though he gave something equally good in *Tom Burke*, which rises to the rank of an historical novel in describing the campaigns of an Irish youth under Napoleon's eagles. Theodore Hook and Tom Hood are at the present day little more than names, and Dickens and Thackeray live more in our memories for *David Copperfield* or *Vanity Fair* than for *Pickwick* or the *Great Hoggarty Diamond*.

'As brass by long attrition tried,
Placed by the purer metal's side,
Displays at length the dingy hue
That proves its former claim untrue,
So Time's discerning hand hath art
To set the good and ill apart.'

This is above all true of imaginative literature. The two ensuing generations, after the appearance of a book, are to it what the Gallery of the Luxembourg is to French pictures. They sift out what is worth preserving. And we say it deliberately—the common consent of mankind, like that of the Egyptian judges, only does embalm what is the production of a high, noble, earnest mind, bent on truth and goodness. *All* thus produced does not live, because genius or talent are requisite to vitality, but genius without goodness merely lives such a life as is led, for instance, by the works of Voltaire, only studied now for curiosity's sake. Why is Dante a life among us, Boccaccio a curiosity? Why is Shakspeare still vividly present with us, while Ben Jonson is but a name; and why does Milton abide with us, while to most of us Dryden is scarcely known? And as poetry has more vitality than prose, the novel has less chance of endurance, and in the sink-or-swim ordeal is sure to sink if weighted with spite, coarseness, or impiety, even though these, like stones, may carry it further at the first moment, and make a greater splash.

Who reads Fielding, Smollett, or Sterne in the present

day, though Richardson, with much inferior power, no wit, and a tradesman's view of the manners of society, has so far held his ground, that *Clarissa*, abridged and purified, has been republished? All the real beauty and pathos of 'Uncle Toby's' character could not prevent *Tristram Shandy* from being so submerged by its coarseness, that Lord Lytton could safely parody its best personages in his *Caxtons*. No, novelists, it is not strength and vigour that ye gain by licence of thought and tongue, it is oblivion.

Next to the proverbially unreadable Aphra Behn, Frances Burney was the first, though not the best novelist in the special feminine sphere of society. She is now only known by her *Diary*, with its glimpses, first, of Johnson, then of Queen Charlotte. Maria Edgeworth's tales have the honour of having awakened Scott's power, but all the earlier ones were so hampered by her father's pedantries that by far the best is her latest, *Helen*, where the lover, Granville Beauclerc, is one of the cleverest sketches we ever saw of an enthusiastic young man, seeing only one side of a question at once. If Miss Edgeworth had not had to dance in fetters, we think she would have achieved as enduring a fame as Jane Austen's.

That popularity is but partial. Those who care only for the big bow-wow, as Scott called his own work compared with hers, find them wearisome from their detail; and few young people have any relish for them, since there is nothing in them to gratify youth's love of hero-worship and adventure. It is only as we grow older, and experience shows us the wonderfully vivid individuality, that the truthfulness of the portraiture grows upon us, and we see the perfection of the art of painting, without vulgarising on the one hand, without idealising on the other, with nothing repulsive and yet nothing beautiful, with humour but without wit, common life indeed, but seen as if in a camera, which somehow deprives it of its harshness. It requires no small skill to tread in these footsteps. When we see, appended to the advertisement of a novel, an extract from some petty local newspaper, declaring it to be 'in Miss Austen's style,' it generally proves to have some vulgar portraits, a great deal of domestic detail, and a large amount of twaddle. In fact, these tales, as well as those kindred ones of Miss Ferrier's, *Marriage* and *The Inheritance*, were the product of those days of calm and rest between the last surges of the French Revolution and the first heavings of the stormy waves of our own time. People were content to draw things as they were rather than as they ought to be, the word 'earnest' was scarcely come into vogue,

and when enthusiastic youth effervesced, as in Marianne Dashwood, it had no vent but sensibility to poetry, romance, and friendship.

Writers of our own day either shoot far above Miss Austen in aim, though not in workmanship, or else fall far below her in purity of tone and all the fruits of what in her time was known as 'good principle.'

When Scott's sense of the fitness of things forced him to find a nobly exceptional fate for his hero Frank Tyrrell, he could do nothing better for him than make him a Moravian, to open to him a missionary career. Now the craving for a mission is almost a staple quality in both man and woman, and the old stage recipe, 'Let him come in and kill some giant,' would now be, 'Let her come in and worry him into killing some abuse.' If the heroine is not to act, she is the last to influence; or, if not, she is fast, horsey, and daring. The 'artless' girl who wore white muslins and pleased by her modest gentleness, would seem vapid besides her 'simple' successor, who shows her simplicity by bold forwardness and embarrassing personal remarks.

No one has so really written in Miss Austen's vein as Mrs. Gaskell in her delicious sketches of the old ladies at *Cranford*, in *Mr. Harrison's Confessions* and *Wives and Daughters*. Yet even in these there is more playfulness and more pathos and indignation than in the earlier author's tales. The fun about Miss Pole's tea-parties, the alarm of robbers, and Mr. Peter's stories are much less subdued than the little ironical hints which make us laugh at Miss Bates or even Mr. Collins, and the indignation we feel at Mrs. Gibson's meannesses entirely outruns any feeling excited by Aunt Norris or Mrs. Bennet. There is something stronger in every way in the later books.

And among four or five others which Mrs. Gaskell has given us, *Mary Barton* is one of the most beautiful and striking stories in our language, full at once of nobleness and sweetness. What can be more touching than the scenes of patient misery in the Strike, or the description of old Alice's deafness? And what can be droller than the journey of the two old grandfathers on the coach with their orphan grandchild, and their vain attempts to put it to sleep with 'two jiggits and a shake?' There was much value and ability in the representation of the utter alienation and misunderstanding of the masters and men, and we believe it worked good in its time. At any rate, this is not a book to be forgotten.

Mrs. Gaskell's name carries us on to her who may be viewed as the first in the school of modern sensation novels—Charlotte Brontë. About her, there has been a curious revolution of feeling, enhanced of late by the publication of more of her correspondence. People were shocked to find that the writer of a book which had been discussed as that of an unsexed woman, or of a man of diseased imagination, was really a harmless, dutiful, hardworking lady. The sensation was, as if hitting at an ugly mask, the blows proved to have hurt a helpless woman, and in the shock of compunction, people forgot to ask 'why did she put on such a mask?' *Jane Eyre* is not better as a book merely because the author meant no harm by it. Her strange circumstances might excuse the author, but the book must stand or fall by its own merits. We cannot help think that another lady author, Florence Wilford, has hit off the most probable explanation of the composition of such a story, in her novel of *Nigel Bartram's Ideal*, where the heroine's troubles are caused by the having published a sensational novel, thrown off, like a sort of eruption, to relieve the workings of her mind, when, from the circumstances around her, it had got into a morbid state. Charlotte Brontë's after-current ran clearer and clearer, and *Villette* is her masterpiece. But each of her three tales is a portrait gallery from her own experience, drawn with immense power, but not original conceptions, and if she had tried to go beyond the range of her own observations, it seems doubtful whether she would have succeeded equally well.

Rivalling, if not exceeding 'Currer Bell' in power, stands our living novelist, 'George Eliot.' We cannot, if we would, discuss all her works. Their varied characters and epigrammatic force, with the strange, sad, undercurrent throughout them, would demand a whole article, if properly examined. To us there is something very painful in the way in which each seems to find all trust, all faith, ring hollow and hollower, ever since that first story which took us all by storm by its wonderful vigour and beauty. 'Adam Bede' and 'Dinah' were grand pictures of the strength and glory of full faith and religion, and they, if report says true, are actual likenesses of the produce of the early days of Wesleyanism; but poor 'Maggie Tulliver' has no strength in her; she tries religious enthusiasm in vain, and her sad story seems all along a pleading of the irresistible force of circumstances. *Romola* actually dares to detract from the pure saintliness of Savonarola's real character (as proved by his biographies) to make him a party man, in order that trust in him likewise may fail

the heroine, whom we find, at the end, revering his memory indeed, but apparently having got beyond the faith he had taught her. 'Dorothea,' again, is ever yearning, ever seeking, never finding, making one great mistake, and sinking at last upon a poor inferior nature, while in *Daniel Deronda* we have enthusiasm indeed, but for what? Something vainer than even Mr. Casaubon's great work, namely, the vain dreams of a Jew, visions of a future founded on his misread prophecies, which a Christian is supposed to adopt and turn back to. If 'Adam Bede' or even 'Nancy Lamiter' are set beside that fascinating gentleman, 'Daniel Deronda' himself, how poor and conventional a hero he becomes beside them!

Taken as portrait galleries, as stores of acute sayings, and, above all, against that smooth, good-tempered, easy selfishness which comes to its climax in Tito, there is nothing that equals these novels, but, alas! that in works of such ability that all England hails their appearance, the true, deep soul is wanting. We are entertained while reading them, but we leave them saddened by the vague feeling that they prove nothing but 'vanity of vanities, all is vanity,' and there is no 'conclusion of the whole matter,' such as the preacher finds us at last.

Charles Kingsley always makes us feel that he has found that conclusion. Not one of his books, though they vary and reflect different moods and phases of mind, is devoid of a hearty, wholesome love of God in His works, and love of our neighbour; and thus we find him reading us higher and better lessons as his life went on, as well he might, for his life was better than his books.

Among the writers whose works throng the library lists there are some whose styles we know as well as we do that of the chief artists of the Royal Academy. Chief among these are, perhaps, Mrs. Oliphant and Miss Mulock, who resemble each other in some respects, both having a certain Scottish raciness and shrewdness, which, moreover, gives them a standpoint somewhat outside the English life with which they are usually concerned.

They seem to us to differ chiefly in this, not only that Miss Mulock has more force, and Mrs. Oliphant more versatility, but that the author of *John Halifax* always has an ideal and a purpose, and is much in earnest about it, while Mrs. Oliphant turns her world inside out and shows it up with a good deal of correctness, but with no particular purpose.

We are very far from always going along with Miss Mulock, or assenting to all that she would inculcate; but there is in

almost all that she does a spirit which invigorates one. More than even her *John Halifax*, does her beautiful tale, *A Noble Life*, give this bracing and hopeful feeling of a victory to be gained and the power to gain it in spite of circumstances. Even *A Brave Lady*, though almost too piteous a story, still shows the triumph of the true and faithful spirit, rising above all the misfortunes which the author has heaped on her, almost too cruelly.

But Mrs. Oliphant, in all her multitudinous and varying tales, seems to stand outside, and laugh at or pity her people, all alike, good, bad, and indifferent, with an exception sometimes for the hero or heroine. She likes to find their flaw, and be satirical over it, and though the biographer of Irving, S. Francis, and Montalembert, she has never attempted to produce an imaginary likeness of a saintly character. Perhaps she was most in earnest over the *Son of the Soil*, where she was on Scottish ground; but her *Chronicles of Carlingford* are her cleverest works, and these are little more than elaborate good-natured satires, chiefly on the clergy. She is almost as fond of showing up clerical life as is Mr. Trollope, and with less knowledge of it, as when misled, we suppose, by the example of Dr. Colenso, she makes a clergyman take a Colonial bishopric in order to have time to finish his book. The wives of clergymen do not receive much mercy at her hands, and in contrast, perhaps, to 'goody books,' she makes parish work appear a dull and dreary round, drawing the few English poor whom she brings in with harsh, untender lines, though the Scots sometimes fare better at her hands. She half admires, half quizzes sisterhoods, and draws droll pictures of the young curate daunted by the weariness of mothers' meetings. Who ever wanted a boy-curate at a mothers' meeting? But there is no question worked out in her tales—no one whom she seems to love, and who for that reason takes a hold of one's mind. They are merely ingenious stories, acted out by a set of people, made very real by a little droll display of their weak points. They are faithful, honourable, affectionate, and not commonplace, but true in their virtues and failings. We like them, that is all. Supposititious children are strangely frequent in these stories. She has the man who finds that he is not himself, but an unconscious impostor; the youth who is supposed to be an impostor, and the lady who, having foisted a false heir on the family, finds him—or, rather his mother—an intolerable encumbrance. The second of the stories we allude to, *Valentine and his Brother*, a sort of parody upon *Valentine and Orson*, is one of the very best of Mrs.

Oliphant's stories. The contrast of the two brothers is charming, and there is more pathos and sweetness than is usual with her, in the description of old Lord and Lady Eskdale when we leave them at the last.

These are tales we are always glad to read : they are clever, sensible, pure, ladylike, and lively, but there is scarcely one that we should care to possess, or to lend to a person whose tone we wished to raise. Yet we can hardly tell why, unless it may be that there is this satirical tone of study and analysis of all lofty motive and strong devotion, from the Dissenting minister to the High Church chaplain, the benevolent lady or the sister.

Miss Ingelow has much more power of poetical and forcible description than Mrs. Oliphant. The scenes of the lonely children playing about the old church, and on the snowy midnight hill, in *Off the Skelligs*, and the strange doom over the old house in *Fated to be Free*, with the weird mystery of the garden, are wondrously beautiful ; and she has likewise a great power of fun, carrying us along irresistibly by her own enjoyment, but both stories are weakened by their rambling disconnected plots, and by having half-completed episodes introduced, as if the author had not taken the trouble to work her charming fragments up into an harmonious whole.

Sarah Tytler almost always is bent on the exaltation of some one female character, who rises gallantly to the occasion, in some form of trying circumstances. She is most happy in scenes of the last century, where she hits off the manners of Scotland with a good deal of brilliancy, but we are rather tired of the inevitable wisdom of her Jeanies and her Maggies, who, however differently they begin, are very apt to end alike. There is, however, a sound, wholesome tone about them all, and there is one little book, called *Heroines of Obscurity*, consisting of several short tales, which we think much more successful than her longer and more ambitious flights.

Space warns us not to dwell longer on individuals, though we should like to linger over Annie Keary's *Castle Daly*, an admirable picture of Ireland as it was before Smith O'Brien's attempt at rebellion, and still more over her beautiful story of *Oldbury*.

Nor will we here touch on the large world of 'tales,' in one, two, or four, but never three volumes—thus to avoid the novel form—which usually profess more of the didactic character, and are more decidedly for the young than the triplet publication attempts to be. We have tried to take a brief survey of the books that exercise a considerable influence in

forming thought and manners, and giving a sort of insight into, and experience of, scenes where the reader otherwise could not penetrate even in fancy.

If a poorly written novel be a means of wasting time, and an unscrupulous one something worse, a real work of art, studied from real life, and portrayed with brilliancy, so as to make real goodness and greatness attractive, is of absolute service. It wins sympathies that would never be caught by graver means, and it places many actions and many classes of persons in a new light, where it is well to see them and study them, and is often, indeed, the means of studying cases of conscience and questions of right and wrong. So far from thinking that the earnestly written novel with a purpose is a mistake, we are decidedly of opinion that one written without thought and principle, however light and attractive it may seem at first, lacks the germ of vitality, and will never endure. Much that is good and sound has but an ephemeral success, but without soundness and goodness nothing does survive. Fiction is the chief mental sustenance of the greater part of the female sex in this country at the present day. We owe it to those who surround us to do our best to keep the supply as pure and true as possible, and the only way in which to carry this out, is by abstinence on the part of ourselves and our families from meddling with what *may* be harmless to us, but certainly will not be harmless to the half educated, whose only training in the morals and ways of life is from these representations, and who eagerly view their descriptions of life as revelations of the manners of the higher classes. To us they are, of course, no standard, but to some, the very young in our own class, and to the numerous young people in a lower one, they are the chief external code as to all the minor morals of life, and, above all, as to the mode of looking on love and marriage. While this is the case, can our novels be a frivolous and unimportant subject?

ART. VI.—THE FIRST NAPOLEON.

[SECOND NOTICE.]

1. *Correspondance de Napoléon I^{er}*. Publiée par ordre de Napoleon III. Lettres XXVIII. Vols. Œuvres de Ste. Hélène, etc. IV. Vols. 32 Vols. 1858-70.
2. *Histoire de Napoléon I^{er}*. Par P. LANFREY. 5 Vols. 6^{me} Edition. 1870.
3. *Histoire et Mémoires*. Par le Général Cte. de SÉGUR. 7 Vols. 1873.

IN a former paper we traced the career of Buonaparte down to the days when the voice of the Parisians—not, on this occasion, altogether free from constraint—substituted the Consulate for the Directory. And we saw that those who were nominally his colleagues neither exercised, nor were intended to exercise, any real control over him, either in his civil or his military capacity. From that day he was, without disguise, the sole ruler of France: for the prolongation of his Consulate, first for ten years, and afterwards for his life, and even the conversion of the Consulate into the Empire, could add nothing to his real power. He even retained the active command of the army, though he was aware that, while the Consulate lasted, his doing so was a violation of the spirit of the law which had established that form of government, and which had regarded Paris as the proper abode of the First Consul, and his duties as consisting in a general superintendence of every department, rather than in an exclusive direction of one. Indeed, he himself professed to consider his civil duties as the most important; and in more than one of his speeches expressed a desire to be remembered by posterity for his achievements in the arts of peace rather than in those of war. And, since we have said enough of his military genius, it is chiefly as a civil magistrate and the governor of a mighty people that we shall henceforward regard him, and seek to estimate the fruits, whether for good or for evil, which his adopted country reaped from his abilities and his disposition.

There can be no question that in many points of the greatest moment he conferred on it great and permanent benefit. Ségur (ii. 1) affirms, with undoubted truth, that the Directory had become an object of such universal contempt,

that people looked on the mere overthrow of that form of government as an act of itself entitling him who had achieved it to the gratitude of the nation. But this was not the only feeling, which made the late change, known in the Revolutionary calendar as the Revolution of the nineteenth Brumaire, generally popular, even before its consequences could be seen. Ségur proceeds to give us such an account of the state of disorganisation and demoralisation in which the whole nation was sunk, and of the improvement which a very short period of the new government sufficed to produce, as may well explain the satisfaction with which even the most thinking Frenchmen accepted the change, and the cheerful zeal with which they from time to time anticipated Buonaparte's wishes for the prolongation and extension of his authority. We can only give the substance of his description. The only prospect was one of general ruin. The army was in the same state of absolute disorganisation as in 1796; even the presence of an enemy in its front did not always suffice to enable the commanders to maintain discipline. The finances were, if possible, in a still worse condition. One general system of fraud and robbery pervaded every department; credit was extinct, the exchequer was empty. Legislation was at a standstill. The executive was paralysed. In the courts of law there was scarcely a pretence of justice. The gaols were crowded with prisoners, while brigands and murderers pursued their vocation unmolested up to the very gates of the city. And, in his admiration at the completeness and rapidity of the improvement effected, Ségur does not scruple to express his conviction that Buonaparte had received a mission from Heaven itself to accomplish an entire regeneration of the country; to create, as it were, a new world out of this chaos—(ii. 4.) Great as were the evils, he was conscious of his power to grapple with them; their very magnitude, instead of perplexing, only animated him; as did also his love of work, his innate aversion to disorder, and his perception of the greatness and reality of the glory to be acquired by their extinction.

Accordingly he at once applied himself to the task before him with all the energy of his mind, and, it must be admitted, with great, if not with entire, success. And that success was owing very mainly to his possession in an eminent degree of that first of all qualifications for a ruler, a keen and accurate insight into the characters of those around him. For he was of a very different stamp from Louis XIV. He had too much common sense to conceive it possible for him to do

everything himself; but he applied himself, with an impartial sagacity which rarely failed him, to select the most fitting instrument for each work. Thus it was that though, while commanding in Italy, he had had more than one difference with Carnot, he still retained that able administrator at the War Office; and that, for the great work of codifying the laws of the kingdom, he placed Tronchet at the head of the Commission; though this display of confidence in one who had been the fearless advocate of Louis XVI. was an open defiance of the Republican party, which had not yet lost all its strength. The management of the Treasury he confided to Gaudin, whose rare financial talents, and still rarer honesty, he was the first to discover. And with the aid of these men he—

'drove the sellers from the Temple, and in the very first days of his power laid the foundation of the admirable administration which subsists to this day.¹ Public credit was restored; the Treasury was replenished. Confidence in the administration of justice revived. The Churches were reopened. Schools were founded and enlarged. Civil war was extinguished. Security was re-established. Political exiles and refugees were restored to their homes and to their country. And thus, after ten years of agony, the grand path of honour and order and prosperity was re-opened to the nation. A new era was to commence; the era of peace crowned with glory'—(ii. 56.)

And this regeneration speedily bore one fruit, which Ségur calls 'the realisation of the Utopia of the Baiser Lamourette,' the union of the ablest and bravest of the citizens of France, to whatever party they might have previously belonged, in support of the new Government to which they owed these blessings.

But one institution which he established sets in a strong light one of the failings which show the littleness of his moral nature. Even the cordial eagerness with which all classes united in his support failed to excite a reciprocal confidence in them. He was innately and incurably suspicious. And he repaid the willing subservience of the people by establishing an espionage (we are proud that we have no English word to express that detestable system) which has never been equalled in its all-searching vigour. No tyranny has ever had so odious an instrument as that now organised and worked by Fouché under the instructions of the First Consul. No class, no individual was so high or so powerful as to be free from its scrutiny. It bore the imputation of more than

¹ M. Ségur was writing these chapters in the latter days of Louis Philippe.

once prompting or making crimes to have the merit of detecting them.¹ And Fouché even carried the audacity of his vigilance so far as to set spies on his Imperial Master himself; and those at times out of his own household—little aware that that master trusted him as little as any one else, and in his turn had spies to bring him intelligence of the Minister's movements and plots, even of those which he believed to be safe from the most prying investigation.

Yet powerful and popular as the First Consul was, he could not as yet do everything that he wished. Even the Jacobins and Regicides he could not venture to defy on every point. And Ségur points out one most remarkable instance in which he felt obliged to temporise with them. He had never concealed his disgust at the shameless decree which had established the anniversary of what Ségur, adopting his language, calls 'the murder of Louis XVI.' as a festival; and he was determined that it should be so celebrated no longer. Yet he could only venture to repeal the decree indirectly by a side-wind; and, much as he would have liked to brand the Regicides with some express reprobation, he could only venture to invalidate it by an edict that henceforward no political festivals should be held but those which marked the beginning of the Revolution and the foundation of the Republic.

'Inter arma silent leges,' and for a while he interrupted his civil labours to devote his whole attention to the campaign in the North of Italy. In a constitutional point of view, as we have seen, his duties as First Consul were inconsistent with his exercise of military command. But he had no idea of being bound by any law but such as he made for himself. He felt, as Ségur says, that his position, having 'been acquired by victory, had need of fresh victories to consecrate it.'—(ii. 25); and that 'entirely to legitimatise his happy accession, it was necessary that he himself should bear the principal part in the salvation of France.' Accordingly, in May he quitted Paris to take the command of the army, being again most fortunate in his antagonist; Mélas, the Austrian commander-in-chief, being older than even Beaulieu or Wurmser. He was eighty years of age, and not only unequal to the fatigue of a protracted

¹ This is admitted by the Duchess d'Abrantès, the position of whose husband (Junot) as Governor of Paris gave him special opportunities of becoming acquainted with the system of operation. Her words are, 'Les agents de police se créaient eux-mêmes des dangers dont ils exaltaient la gravité et redoublaient le mystère.'—*Mémoires de Mme. la Duchesse d'Abrantès*, vol. vii. c. i. p. 9.

campaign, but incapable of sustaining for even a single day the labour of a stubbornly contested battle. Buonaparte's aim was so far accomplished that he gained one of his most important victories; yet none was ever won in which the success was so accidental and undeserved. And, again, the account given of Marengo by the two biographers affords a very striking specimen of the different spirit in which they applied themselves to their work. It must be admitted that the comparison suggested is not entirely to the disadvantage of M. Lanfrey. Ségur indeed can hardly be acquitted of a gross want of candour in the constant sneers in which he indulges at the conduct of Moreau, who at the same time was commanding the army of the Rhine; and still less in his marvellous misstatement of the numbers of the hostile armies at Marengo, where he affirms that the Austrians 'nearly trebled' the French (ii. 73), though the force which Mélas had on the field was really 31,000 against 29,000. And, while he relates the strategy which preceded the battle, and the battle itself, with brilliant vigour, he abstains from giving the slightest hint that Kellermann's charge,¹ which in fact changed a rout into a triumph, was a sudden and spontaneous seizure of an unforeseen opportunity by the young General himself, and not a part of the plan of the Commander-in-chief; he equally suppresses the fact that the plan of the whole campaign has been severely criticised as one which incurred risks wholly needless, which crippled Moreau's operations in the valley of the Danube, and involved the certain sacrifice of Masséna and the heroic garrison with which he was defending Genoa, for no object whatever but that of enabling Buonaparte to engross the chief glory of the year.

Lanfrey, on the other hand, displays the achievements of Moreau in a light which, however striking, is not more brilliant than they deserve:

'Since the opening of the campaign, Moreau had in one fortnight gained five victories: he had inflicted on Kray a loss of 30,000 men; he had beaten him from a position which seemed impregnable; he had driven him back forty leagues, defeated and demoralised; he had, in a word, realised, step after step, the plan which he had traced out beforehand, without failing in his encounter of a single

¹ It is singular that Alison speaks of this charge as having been made by the Kellermann who had gained the battle of Valmy, and as if there were but one Kellermann in the French army; while he might have learnt from the *Mémoires of Madame d'Abrantès*, which he continually quotes for other purposes, that the hero of Marengo was the son of him who was afterwards made Duc de Valmy.—*Madame d'Abrantès*, iii. c. ii. p. 48.

difficulty ; without leaving anything to chance, following a method which may have been a little slow, but which was sure, and which economised the lives of his soldiers ; and he had done all this without any noise, without any pompous despatches, without any theatrical display'—(ii. 158.)

He is evidently suggesting, though without formally instituting, a comparison with the exploits of Buonaparte himself, and proceeds to point out how Moreau's successes had placed the great Austrian entrenched camp at Ulm, if not Vienna itself, wholly at his mercy, when he was 'arrested in the middle of his triumphs and compelled to weaken his army by 20,000 men, that his rival might march into Italy and gather all the fruit and all the honour of the victory.'

And finally, after enumerating with merciless precision and great vigour of argument the objections to the whole plan of the campaign which we have already mentioned, though he does not deny the deserved praise to the energy and fertility of resource with which it was carried out, he sums up the whole with a declaration that a scheme thus devised and executed, solely that 'the First Consul might gather in a single day the reward of the protracted labours of Masséna and Moreau, was one which, though a man of unbridled ambition might risk, one who deserved the title of a great citizen would have rejected.'

It can hardly be denied that the soundness of this criticism is supported not only by the writer's arguments, but by the unquestioned facts of the case. Subsequent wars proved that the key to the Imperial dominions lay in the valley of the Danube ; and there Moreau was wantonly arrested in his career of victory, and the prey within his reach was saved from his grasp : while at Genoa Masséna, with his gallant garrison, was sacrificed and compelled to surrender ; and, had it not been for an unforeseen accident, boldly and skilfully taken advantage of by another, Buonaparte's own army would have been crushed by overwhelming disaster. We cannot avoid the conclusion that, in incurring these risks and making these sacrifices, Buonaparte was seeking, not the welfare of the army, and still less that of France, but was looking solely to his personal aggrandisement.

For that object undoubtedly he had calculated well. When he complimented Kellermann on his cavalry charge, the young General replied that he might well be pleased, since it had placed the crown on his head. Buonaparte never forgave the boast, but within the week he gave proof that he shared the belief which had dictated it. He entered Milan in tri-

umph, and, as he announced his intention of repairing to the Cathedral to return thanks for his victory, the Archbishop inquired with what honours he expected to be received. The answer was, 'As the Archbishop would have received his own sovereign had he been the conqueror: I am perhaps full as important as the Emperor of Austria.'¹ His exulting language was recollected by those who heard it; and at a later period, 'when he had changed the Republic into an Empire, and had founded a fourth dynasty'—(S. ii. 81), the French officers saw a foreshadowing of these results in this proud assertion of an equality with the heir of the Cæsars.

The war did not last much longer. Before the end of the year Moreau gained a victory over the Archduke Charles at Hohenlinden still more decisive than that of Marengo, inasmuch as the armies engaged were far larger, and Hohenlinden was nearer Vienna. The Russian Czar, the half-crazy Paul, deserted the alliance, and the Emperor Francis, thus left alone—for England was confining her exertions in Europe to naval enterprises—felt himself unable single-handed to maintain the war against France. At the beginning of 1801 he made peace at Lunéville; and we may fairly assert that before the end of the year Buonaparte had reason to become at least as weary of the war with England. She had dissolved the Northern Confederacy by Nelson's cannon at Copenhagen; and she had reduced the Generals whom he left behind in Egypt to an ignominious capitulation. This last disaster, if we may trust Madame d'Abrantès, being felt by him as a blow which more than counterbalanced all his successes in Italy. England, whose objects in carrying on the war had been purely defensive, was equally willing to treat; and before the end of the year preliminaries were signed, though it was not till the spring of 1802 that the treaty was definitively and formally concluded at Amiens.

This peace has been called an armed truce, and there can be no doubt that none of the belligerents had such confidence in its continuance as to relax for a single moment their attention to the measures necessary for the maintenance and even the augmentation of their warlike establishments. Buonaparte himself did so least of all; since, besides

¹ 'Dites qu'il me reçoive comme il aurait reçu son souverain s'il m'eût vaincu. Je vauz bien l'Empereur d'Autriche, peut-être'—(S. ii. 18.) If his words are correctly reported, it is remarkable that he gave the Emperor a title that at that time had never been heard of. Francis was Emperor of Germany at this time, and did not lay aside this title for that of Emperor of Austria till some years later.

his fondness for war as a field in which as yet he had no rival, he looked on it as a necessity of his position as chief of the Republic. A Republic, as he told Gohier, 'should never make any but partial accommodations; it should always contrive to have some war on hand to keep alive the warlike spirit.' And, after he had become Emperor, he seems to have been still more impressed with the conviction that his hold on the affections of the French could only be maintained by a succession of warlike triumphs, which should keep their eyes fixed on him as the man whose power was indispensable to and identical with the glory of which they were so proud.

Still, though he regarded this pacification as only a respite, he did not the less employ the leisure it gave him on civil objects, and his peaceful labours during the next two years in many respects well entitled him to the gratitude of the nation, even if we admit that the benefit of the people was not his sole object. Undoubtedly he desired to consolidate and perpetuate his own power, and he saw that many changes were required to bring back the French to a disposition compatible with the permanence of any authority. Undoubtedly he was ambitious of a lasting fame; while no one was more deeply impressed with the fact that the most durable reputation cannot be acquired by warlike talents and achievements alone. But it is neither wise nor fair to refuse rulers credit for their good deeds because such acts contribute also and were meant to contribute to their own advantage and honour; nor to deny that the spirit which prompts them is so far a useful and a noble ambition.

He had not waited for the actual termination of the war to resume his work as a legislator. Immediately after Marengo he returned to Paris, and, as if he regarded the operations of the army on the Danube as matters entirely out of his province, he again devoted his whole attention to measures to effect the civil regeneration of the people. He appointed a Commission to reduce the laws of the nation into one comprehensive and intelligible Code; selecting with the greatest impartiality, as we have said before, the ablest lawyers in the kingdom for the work, even though some were notorious for their attachment to the old line of princes; and he himself attended their sittings with great assiduity, taking a leading part in their discussions, and astonishing all by his sagacious acquaintance with the principles of jurisprudence, and even with the details of legal proceedings. Nor did he content himself with restoring the powers of and

reviving the respect for the civil law. He was equally sensible of the importance of ecclesiastical law also, and of the re-establishment of a decent outward respect for religion and its ministers. He had given one indication of this feeling when, as we have seen, he visited the Cathedral at Milan to return thanks to the Almighty for his victory of Marengo. And he had scarcely returned to Paris before he began to avail himself of the opening which he had thus made towards the re-establishment of friendly relations with the Pope, by proposing a Concordat which should settle the position of the State and the Church towards each other on an intelligible and distinct footing. No one will attribute to Buonaparte any deep feeling of devotion, or of the reverence which conscientious Roman Catholics feel for the Pope. On the contrary, some years afterwards he stripped the Pope of the greater part of his dominions and carried him off as prisoner to France, with the express object, as he stated himself, of disabusing men's minds of the idea that he feared the thunders of the Church—(*Corr.* xxx. 343.) And with respect to religion, his idea was that some religion or other was necessary as an instrument of Government, to dispose the minds of men to the requisite submission to authority; that it was, as he called it to Las Cases, 'the foundation of morality, and of true principles, of good conduct'—(*Corr.* xxxii. 269); but that, so long as men entertained some belief or other, what that belief was was of little importance. That there was a God, no one, he affirmed, could possibly doubt; but all religions were evidently human inventions—(*ib.* 268.) And, as preachers of religion, he placed Moses, Mohammed, Confucius, and our Saviour on an equal footing; while he affirmed that the priests of every religion had always thriven and depended on fraud and falsehood. Some religion or other, therefore, he resolved to establish. For a moment he hesitated between Popery and some form of Protestantism, from a suspicion that the majority of Frenchmen who believed anything inclined to spiritual independence; but, on reflection, he came to the opinion that no Protestant prelate could be as useful to him as the Pope; and, declaring that 'if the Pope had not existed before, he must have been created for the occasion, as the old Romans created a dictator in times of difficulty'—(*Corr.* xxx. 539), in the summer of 1801 he addressed his proposals formally to the Roman Court. They were gladly received, and the principal Minister of the Vatican, the celebrated Cardinal Consalvi, was sent to Paris to conduct the negotiation. Ségur,

whose plan allows him to pass over transactions of which he had no personal knowledge, says nothing of the Concordat, but Lanfrey enters fully into the details of the negotiation, narrating the peremptoriness with which the First Consul pretended to limit the discussions to five days; the firm stand which the clerical diplomatist made for some of the Papal prerogatives; and, of course, not forbearing to place in a strong light the gross dishonesty of Buonaparte in substituting for the treaty to which Consalvi had really agreed a document containing the most objectionable of the provisions which he had rejected, and in the rejection of which the French Commissioners, with Joseph Buonaparte at their head, had acquiesced; and in endeavouring thus to entrap the Cardinal into concessions which he had never made, and which, in his view, loyalty to his God and to his sovereign the Pope alike forbade him to make—(L. ii. 356.) Perhaps in the whole of Buonaparte's career there is nothing more singular than that in the very act of re-establishing religion as 'the foundation of good principles and morality,' he should have stooped to a fraud for which his Civil Code would have sent any one of his subjects to the galleys. Still the baseness of the trick does not diminish the service which he conferred on France by thus publicly repudiating the atheism of the Convention, and we should hardly do justice to him in this respect if we omitted to take into account the vehemence of the discontent which the measure excited among many of his most valued supporters. Many years afterwards he himself related to Montholon that Lannes had forced his way into his study to remonstrate against it; and others made their dissatisfaction more public. He caused the establishment of the Concordat to be celebrated by a grand religious ceremony in the great Metropolitan Cathedral of Notre Dame; a splendid company, of generals, fine ladies, foreign ambassadors, and courtiers, was invited or summoned to assist. The venerable Church, reopened after a long desecration, glittered with fine dresses and jewels, and re-echoed the swelling notes of the anthem. 'What,' as the strain died away—'What,' said Buonaparte to General Delmas, 'did you think of the ceremony?' 'It was a fine piece of mummery,' replied the surly Republican. 'Nothing was wanting but the million of men who have perished to destroy what you have now revived.' And for kindred reasons, though of inferior weight, we are inclined to praise the institution of the Legion of Honour. It was a reassertion of the principle that great talents and eminent

services are entitled to conspicuous honour and reward, however such honour and reward may trench upon abstract ideas of equality. It is characteristic of Lanfrey that he expresses the most decided disapproval of the principle, while commending the policy of the act as applied to Frenchmen. He regards it as one calculated to quiet the restlessness of variety, not to satisfy the honest pride of a great nation. And he denounces the notion of

'the State constituting itself the sovereign judge of talents and virtues in all the spheres of human activity ; of its pretending to classify their merit, and to affix to each the share of consideration which is its due, as one which could only enter into the mind of a despot'—(ii. 443.)

Some such objections influenced the Council of State, in which the project was gravely discussed, and strenuously opposed, even by some who were not actuated by any vehement republicanism. Nor did Buonaparte feel himself as yet strong enough to overbear all opposition, thinking probably that for such an object he could afford to wait. His argument shows that his estimate of the French character agreed with that expressed by Lanfrey, that it was vain, not proud ; for while admitting that stars, crosses, and ribbons were toys, he said that it was with toys that they were to be led. And he ventured on one assertion strangely at variance with the professions of every assembly which had met in France since 1789, and of every faction which had held sway over the nation, that 'the French did not in reality love either liberty or equality ; they had not been so changed by the years of revolution ; they were still the same as the Gauls of old, fond of distinctions'—(ii. 444.) But he yielded so far as to postpone the measure, and the establishment of the Legion of Honour was not fully carried out till he was seated on the imperial throne—(S. ii. 206.)

No doubt he foresaw that the attainment of such sovereignty was not far distant ; and we may be sure that the same expectation secretly animated many of those who opposed the establishment of the Legion, and who saw in it a stepping-stone to the revival of a court. They had many signs to lead them to such a conclusion. In the spring of 1802 he had made an open inroad on the authority of those deliberative and legislative bodies which, in the establishment of the Consulate, had been devised as checks on the authority of the First Consul, by taking into his own hands the nomination of the new members to fill up the yearly

vacancies. And in the summer he had procured a vote of the nation appointing him Consul for life. It was equally significant that on his reception at the Tuileries he began to resume the old phraseology; to address men as *Monsieur* instead of *Citoyen*; to talk of weeks instead of decades, and of January and July instead of *Nivôse* and *Thermidor*. When he signed the Concordat, he had said that he was vaccinating the French with religion, in order to make them take it lightly. He may be said to have been now inoculating them with the forms of a court to ensure their taking the infection into their constitution.

But his mind was large enough and active enough to embrace many objects at once. And his schemes for his personal aggrandisement were not allowed for a moment to interrupt his useful labours for the benefit of the people, his development of the resources of the nation, his encouragement of manufactures, his establishment of schools, and for the special gratification of the Parisians—his adornment and improvement of the capital. It may be that in many of these measures a preference for what was showy over what was solid may be detected; but it must be admitted that for the most part they entitled him to the admiration of the people, which they certainly earned for him. Nor were these labours materially checked by the renewal of war, for, as we have intimated, the peace of 1801 did not last long. In his later days there was no assertion on which Buonaparte insisted with greater pertinacity than that he had never provoked war; that others had attacked him, and that he had been dragged into hostilities by the necessity of defending himself. But no profession was ever more at variance with the truth, and no assertion was ever more dictated by a confidence that those who heard it would not dare to contradict him. At St. Helena he described himself as 'giving the law to all Europe.' And this assertion that he was in every instance the party attacked instead of the assailant, when viewed in connexion with the real facts of each case, can only mean that he was so fully entitled to be the master of all Europe, that the least resistance to any one of his measures was a wanton attack on his prerogative: that, if he offered a public insult to an English ambassador; if he violated the neutrality of Prussian territory; if he kidnapped the Royal family of Spain; if he stripped the nearest relative of the Russian Emperor of part of his dominions, neither England, nor Prussia, nor Spain, nor Russia could have the slightest right to remonstrate against such injuries, far less to resent them by war. We need not waste

time in protesting against, or refuting such pretensions. His own words on other occasions display their hollowness, and his own friends deny their validity. It was not only that he was fond of war as the field the best suited to the display of his talents, he still felt war to be a necessity of his situation, and of all governments which rest on a similar foundation. And with respect to the renewal of this particular war in 1803, Count M. Dumas, one of the officers in whom he deservedly placed the greatest confidence, affirms that 'Napoleon judged on many occasions, and perhaps he was right upon his political system, that it was more advantageous for him to be the aggressor, in order to retain all his advantages.'

Accordingly, in the spring of 1803, he rekindled the war. During the entire period of the peace, and even before it was signed, he had been giving constant proofs of his aggressive spirit, establishing a new constitution in Holland, overrunning Switzerland with an army, and effecting a revolution in that country, the sole object of which was to ensure her subserviency to France; and when, in consequence, the English Government hesitated to carry out all the provisions of the Treaty of Amiens and to evacuate Malta, he published an offensive report, which one of his officers had been instructed to make, and which affirmed that 'England, single-handed, was unable to cope with France,' and then, at a party which he caused Joséphine to give for the express purpose of making the outrage more conspicuous,² he gave way to one of his calculated explosions of anger, and insulted the British Ambassador with reproaches and menaces which were certainly a novelty in modern diplomacy, and to which the recall of the Ambassador, in whose person the whole nation had been insulted, was the only reply. It is significant of M. de Ségur's thorough-going advocacy of his old chief, heightened by a hatred of England which, we regret to say, he loses no opportunity of expressing, that, instead of condemning the unprecedented insolence of language adopted by the First Consul, he sees in it only a 'noble frankness,' and wonders how it could fail to have been appreciated as such by 'English malevolence'—(ii. 207); and that he mentions without a single word of reprobation the unexampled

¹ *Mémoires of his own Time*, by Lieut.-Gen. Count Mathieu Dumas, ii. 201.

² This is his own admission. 'Au cercle de Mme. Buonaparte il a saisi l'occasion d'exprimer sa juste indignation devant une assemblée faite pour donner de l'éclat à ses paroles'—*Corr.* viii. 250.

detention of the English travellers who happened to be in France ; in which M. Lanfrey rather sees evidence of his desiring to impart 'an implacable character' to the war between the two nations—(L. iii. 4.)

On the war, which gradually dragged all Christendom into its vortex, we have no space, nor any great temptation, to dwell. The victories which he gained, though more conspicuous as the fruit of battles on a large scale, and followed by more striking events, such as the capture of Vienna, Berlin, Madrid, and other capital cities, and by the prostration of the whole of Continental Europe at his feet, do not perhaps show more brilliant ability than his earlier campaigns in Italy. Indeed, we believe it to be the opinion of the most competent judges that, if we are to seek for a parallel to those first exploits of his genius, we must look, not at those campaigns in which he was wielding the yet undiminished power of France and her allies, and securing success by the superiority of his force, but at that last contest in the plains of Champagne, where he struggled single-handed against overwhelming numbers, with a fertility of resource, a vigour and a tenacity which won the admiration of his bitterest enemies, and more than once seemed to counterbalance the greatest odds that could be brought against him.

But the war did not impede his attainment of the Crown, which he had now for some time made his chief object, if, indeed, it did not further it by increasing the idea in the minds of the nation that he was the indispensable man whose pleasure was on every point to be the law. There was, in fact, no obstacle in his way. Whether he were right or wrong in thinking that the French had never really desired liberty, it was clear that they were now ready to be slaves, and eager to anticipate his wishes by the most precipitate submission. It needed only that some of his tools should suggest the propriety of making him sovereign in name as well as in fact, for the whole nation with a rare unanimity to entreat him to accept the Crown as if he were conferring a favour on it by condescending to become its master. It was even probable that his assumption of sovereignty would be received in no unfriendly spirit by Foreign States, so desirable did it seem that France should have a strong hand to rule her, and that that ruler should be placed above any temptation to seek to raise himself to a higher rank. Yet, at this moment, when everything was proceeding smoothly according to his utmost wishes, he chose wantonly to set the world against him, and

to sully his fame for ever by a wanton crime—the seizure in a foreign country and the execution of the Duc d'Enghien; his object in which, even after all the various explanations of his motives which he gave at different times, is still incomprehensible. With what horror it was regarded by all the most respectable of his own partisans is powerfully displayed in the narrative of Ségur himself, who, in this instance alone, finds no excuse for him, but rather takes an honest pride in the plainness of his denunciations—(ii. p. 264.) And with what astonishment it struck even those to whom honour, virtue, and humanity were unintelligible phrases, and who professed to judge by no standard but that of present expediency, may be seen in the expression of the callous Fouché, that 'it was worse than a crime—it was a blunder.' It was, indeed, the grossest of blunders, as profitless as it was wicked, and the more inconceivable as being an unanswerable refutation of his boast that his 'elevation was unstained by crime.' Up to this time, so far as France was concerned (for the massacre at Jaffa, hideous as it was, was no offence against her), he could make this boast with truth. It was his singular good fortune that the guilt of others had opened the door for his greatness, without his 'filing his mind' with any participation in their atrocities; and it would almost seem as if he grudged the Jacobins and Girondins their monopoly of wickedness, and as if his design had been to show, by the wanton murder of the only Prince of the blood whom he could reach, that he would have been capable of shedding the blood of Louis himself if it had seemed conducive to his interest. How he judged the death of the Duc d'Enghien likely to conduce to it is still difficult to conceive. His own last explanation, after a base endeavour to vilify the memory of his victim by the false assertion¹ that the Duke had offered him his services, was that he put him to death 'because it was necessary to the safety, interest, and honour of the French people, since the Comte d'Artois, by his own confession, was maintaining sixty assassins at Paris.'² It is true that more than one Royalist conspiracy had been detected, but it is, of course, utterly false that the Count had confessed his complicity with any scheme of assassination; and, not to mention that those who really were guilty were at that very time in prison awaiting their trial and certain conviction, Buonaparte was far too shrewd to expect to terrify those who were beyond his reach by the murder of those

¹ *Corr.* xxxii. 329.

² His Will, dated April 15, 1821. *Corr.* xxxii. 477. He died May 5.
VOL. IV.—NO. VII. N

who were within it. He must have foreseen that the feeling which it was most likely to kindle in their breasts was a desire for vengeance rather than fear. He spoke of the necessity of making an example; putting the innocent to death is no example to deter the guilty. And what we may most probably regard as his real object was not so much to terrify those in other countries who might be disposed to conspire against him, as to cut off all prospect of their obtaining allies from among his own adherents by placing an impassable gulf between them and the old family; since, in the event of any restoration of the Bourbons, there could be no pardon from them for those who were stained with participation, or even acquiescence, in the murder of their kinsman.

But he was not content with making himself the equal of other sovereigns. He desired to be acknowledged as their superior. He chose the title, not of King, but of Emperor, though it was one not recorded in the French annals, because it had been borne by Charlemagne; and he persuaded or intimidated the Pope into visiting Paris to place the crown on his head; rewarding the Pontiff's condescension with a series of petty incivilities and marked slights, such as no well-bred gentleman would have offered to the meanest guest. Yet perhaps he wished for a moment that he had been contented with the service of one of his own prelates, when, as Joséphine was to be crowned too, Pius insisted on the previous performance of the religious rites of marriage, refusing to recognise the civil ceremony, which as yet had alone passed between them. And Napoleon (as we must henceforth call him), who was already meditating a divorce, was greatly annoyed at being forced to submit to a step which might throw obstacles in the way of a second marriage—(L. iii. 239.)

It could surprise no one that the erection of an Imperial throne should be followed by a restoration of all the pomp and ceremony and etiquette of a court, nor was it unnatural that to the old nobility which the new Emperor sought, not unsuccessfully, to draw around him, he should add a new nobility of his own most distinguished followers; though it is singular that in no instance did he select their titles from places in France, but that he seemed to prefer identifying them with his fields of battle and victory, or with the foreign countries which he had brought under French influence. But he was not contented with achieving sovereignty for himself; he conferred it on his brothers also; making Joseph King of Naples, Louis King of Holland, Jerome King of Westphalia

—in each case greatly against their own inclination. Even his sisters received Principalities in Italy; while, as if on purpose to teach how entirely he regarded the authority he conferred on them as subordinate to his own, he afterwards transferred Joseph to Madrid, as he might have transferred a general from one regiment to another; giving Naples to Murat, whose birth was so low that it was with great difficulty that he had been brought to think him a fit husband for his sister, even when he himself, though First Consul, was still nominally only a citizen.¹ His brothers could scarcely have any feeling but reluctance at the position which he thus forced upon them, for, as he himself explained it to them, it was but a phantom royalty, the 'likeness of a kingly crown,' divested of all real authority; and no act of his whole life shows more completely his absorbing selfishness than the language which he addressed to them. 'Never forget that your first duties are to me; your second to France. All your other duties, even those towards the people whom I entrust to your government, come after those.' And so thoroughly was he impressed with the conviction that this tone of dictation to those whom he called kings was such as he had a right to use, that we find him at St. Helena complaining of the injury that his brothers had done him by 'identifying themselves with their new subjects, and preferring their interests to his.'²

Even Ségur cannot avoid confessing that an ambition which thus thrust kingly greatness upon men 'unused to royalty, unknown to the nations which they were to rule, and ignorant of their feelings and habits, transgressed all bounds of reason and moderation'—(ii. 495), and Lanfrey, as might be expected, is far louder in his denunciation of it as 'a miserable expedient of despotism,' while, in the kindred feeling which made him seek alliances for his brothers among families of royal blood, and even compel his youngest brother Jerome to divorce his wife to marry a Princess of Wurtemberg, he sees only a proof of an innate and ineradicable vulgarity of mind—(iii. 407-9.) Nor is he more merciful to the notorious Berlin decree, which he brands not only as a tyrannical abuse of power, but as a proof that he had become so intoxicated by success as to have allowed it to cloud that clearness of intellect and political sagacity for which, till that time, he had deservedly obtained such general credit—(iii. 512.) To some extent Ségur agrees with him on this subject, thinking the Continental system

¹ De Bourrienne, iii. 284.

² Las Cases, vii. 98.

which the decree aimed at establishing very doubtful in point of policy, and admitting that it was one to which nothing but terror could induce the Continent to submit—(iii. 45), though he seeks to find some excuse for it by representing this 'abuse of Continental power' as a retaliation for 'the abuse of maritime power' displayed in the British Orders in Council: an assertion disproved by the dates of the different documents, which prove beyond the possibility of contradiction that those Orders, however impolitic, were but a reply to the Berlin decree.¹ With what merciless severity Napoleon trampled down Prussia after his victory at Jena, with what unmanly malice he pursued the Queen because he attributed the hostility of the country mainly to her influence, and how deep a desire for revenge he implanted in the whole nation, has been told a hundred times. But Ségur has left us a proof that in some Prussian bosoms these feelings were overcome by admiration for his abilities and the attractiveness of his manners,—which, when he thought it worth his while to conciliate, was irresistible, in a story which we do not recollect to have seen before, and which is eminently characteristic of the man who, in his proclamations to the army in Egypt, had placed the title of 'Member of the Institute' before that of Commander-in-chief. One evening he invited to the palace at Berlin, Humboldt, Müller, and some of the other men eminent for their literary or scientific attainments, who were at that time in the city—

"They all quitted his presence full of admiration and penetrated with gratitude. One of them, the distinguished historian, Jean de Müller, has recorded his recollection of the evening. "Never, since his interviews with the great Frederick, had he heard conversation so varied, so clear, so energetic." And for profundity and largeness of conception he gives the Emperor the palm in preference to the great King. In other respects, and especially in the winning expression of the mouth, he found, he says, the same seductive sweetness. And he adds some curious details of the pains Napoleon took to gain him over, such as the persistence with which he addressed his conversation exclusively to him, though surrounded by so many personages of high rank, and the delicate attention which he showed him at a concert by ordering the performance of some of the national airs of his own country. It was thus that both Napoleon and Frederick courted, in the historian of their age, one of the hundred voices of that Fame for which they made such sacrifices. And Napoleon gained his end, for Müller closes his account with the declaration "that the conversation

¹ The date of the Berlin decree was November 21, 1806; that of the first Order in Council, signed by Lord Howick, January 7, 1807.—Alison, i. § 9.

had rendered the 19th of November the most remarkable in his whole life, and that the natural affability and genius of Napoleon had made a conquest of him"—(iii. 67.)

Austria, Prussia, and Italy were at his feet; at the end of a few months Friedland laid Russia equally prostrate; Alexander, with that weakness which is insensible to shame, hastening to fawn upon his conqueror, and courting his momentary favour by a profession of eagerness to desert the alliance with England and to exchange it for one with him. Napoleon had some reason to say, as he did at St. Helena, that

'the world invited him to become its master; that sovereigns and subjects rivalled one another in the haste with which they placed themselves under his sceptre. He had found more resistance from a few obscure and unarmed Frenchmen than from all these kings put together.'

Unfortunately for himself, he was so impressed with the pusillanimity of the Kings, that he forgot that their people might not always be equally submissive, and he had scarcely completed the humiliation of Russia, before an insult as unparalleled as treacherous offered to a King on the opposite side of Europe roused a whole nation to arms, and brought on a war which was one main cause of his ruin. If M. Lanfrey denounces the attack on the Peninsular nations as at once an atrocity and a folly, and exposes with caustic energy the absurdity of the pretences with which Napoleon occasionally sought to create a belief that Talleyrand had entrapped him into it contrary to his intention (iv. 166), Ségur laments it in terms which, coming from him, are not less of a condemnation, though his language is such as to raise a suspicion that what he mourns over is its failure rather than its iniquity, and that his opinion of it would have been different had it led to 'the completion of the ruin of England' instead of proving the greatest obstacle to her overthrow—(iii. 216-233.)

In tracing the history of the last half of the Empire, Ségur perceives a divided duty. Some of his recollections of these years he cannot avoid describing as melancholy. He tries to make what excuse he can for the spoliation of the Holy See of all its territories, and for the still stranger seizure and imprisonment of the Sovereign Pontiff, by pronouncing Pius himself not free from blame in 'failing to comprehend the necessities of the Emperor's position'—(iii. 213), though he fails to explain what those necessities were which could drive him to what Ségur himself cannot refrain from characterising as a

'precipitate abuse of power.' And, when he comes to speak of the divorce of Joséphine, and the marriage to an Austrian Archduchess, his exultation at what he describes as 'one of the greatest victories, gained at once over the evil side of the revolution, of which it marked the close, and over the counter-revolution, which was thus quelled in the humiliation of the most aristocratic of courts' (iii. 432), is dashed by sympathy for

'the gracious, amiable lady, who, if [not free from some weaknesses, had herself sympathised with every private or public sorrow; had been gentle to all; had had no vanity but that of pleasing; had never been intoxicated nor in any degree changed by her prosperity; whose only care seemed to have been to make the world overlook and pardon her elevation by the use she made of it'—(iii. 427.)

And he pities Napoleon too, not only for the violence, which, as he contends, he did to his own affections for the sake of the public interest, but for the loss of a counsellor whose voice had been always given on the side of prudence and moderation. We may doubt whether, in the sympathy which Ségur expresses for the husband, he is not attributing to him qualities which he would himself have disowned. The divorce can hardly have inflicted on him any of that laceration of heart which his biographer deplures, for Napoleon was incapable of feeling an ennobling affection for any woman. He did not even pretend it. He regarded women as at best the toys of an hour, and constantly praised the Turkish method of treating them as the one best suited to their characters. But it is not the less true that he often repented the step; and that in the latter years of his life he pronounced his marriage with Marie Louise an error which had ruined him, by inspiring him with a false confidence in the foreign support which he might expect for his political schemes. But at the moment the extortion of the consent of the successor of the Cæsars to such an alliance was regarded by the world in general, and, above all, by himself, as the greatest of his political triumphs. And, when, in the spring of 1811, the new Empress presented him with a son, the birth of an heir to his honours seemed to fill up the measure of his prosperity, and to complete all that was required to render it perpetual. If, as we have seen Ségur affirm, Joséphine's counsels had always been those of prudence and moderation, Napoleon's loss in parting from her had been great indeed, for every day such a counsellor was more and more needed. Ségur confesses that every fresh access of prosperity served only to inflame his ambition (iii. 469), and that he had become so impatient of any difference

of opinion, even in the most trivial matters, that 'it was often dangerous to cross his path'—(*ib.* 456.) Even the warmest admirers of his genius began to have melancholy forebodings when they contemplated the variety and vastness of the different undertakings in which he embarked at once—(*ib.* 447); and they were appalled when, in spite of the heavy blows which, at the beginning of 1812, his army had sustained in the Peninsula, they saw him wantonly provoke a fresh war with Russia, and plunge headlong into an enterprise which would have taxed to the uttermost the undivided resources of the Empire. If among the highest qualifications for command be the judgment to proportion one's undertakings to one's means, it can hardly be denied that in this attribute of a first-rate general Napoleon was deficient. He was now manifestly aiming at universal dominion, and, if the object was insane, the attempt to accomplish it by carrying on war at once at Cadiz and Moscow was more insane still—(*ib.* 474.) Even Ségur shows that it was not Russia that made war on Napoleon, but Napoleon who wantonly attacked Russia, and can only allege in extenuation of the folly that 'the errors of a man of genius are not to be explained by blindness on one single point, but have many causes' (476), of which (as he leaves us to infer) inferior minds can hardly be competent judges.

Ségur's narrative of the Russian war we may forbear to examine. The fifty years during which it has been before the world have settled its place in military literature as one of the master-pieces of its class. It would be painful to dwell needlessly on the disasters and sufferings even of an enemy, when so overwhelming and unparalleled; yet perhaps the most irreparable mischief of the campaign, so far as Napoleon's future fortunes were concerned, is to be found in the extent to which, as Ségur tells us (*vi.* 2), it had shaken the faith of his followers, and had taught them to discard the belief in his invincibility, and (in their inmost hearts) in the permanence of his authority.

In truth the retreat from Moscow was the beginning of the end. In the fifteen months which ensued, the war which he was waging was no longer aggressive. For the first time he was standing on his defence, seeking at first to avert, and latterly to repel the invasion of France. And from the first day of battle to the last we must alternately admire his inexhaustible fertility of resource, his energy, his fortitude, his shrewd judgment of the characters and probable courses of his different antagonists, and marvel at the blind tenacity with which, in spite of all inducements to a contrary course, he persisted

both in 1813 and in 1814 in rejecting all terms of accommodation ; while at the same time he disarmed himself of the last means of effectual resistance by retaining as the garrison of different fortresses in Germany a vast force of veterans sufficient of themselves to constitute a formidable army.

If his efforts in these years had been exerted as a military commander carrying out the orders of an over-ruling civil authority, our admiration of the military skill which he displayed would be unqualified and unbounded. But the case is widely different when we recollect that he himself was the absolute master of his own movements ; and obstinacy, such as he now displayed in persisting in the war under conditions in which success was absolutely impossible, in ordinary cases could hardly be denied heavily to impeach a claim to the highest ability as a warrior or as a statesman. But in his case it may probably admit of explanation damaging to his moral rather than to his intellectual excellence. It probably arose from that profound and absorbing selfishness which, in every part of his career, was one of his most conspicuous characteristics. It was not, from love for France that he rejected the offers of the Allies made and repeated many times between June 1813 and March 1814. For his councillors, men of eminent sagacity, were at least as sincerely interested in the safety and prosperity of France as himself, and, as Ségur admits, were unanimous in imploring him to accept the terms proposed at Chatillon. And well might they give such advice. To the very last day of the Congress those terms were so liberal as to show more of the moderation of the Allies than of their wisdom. He had set them no such example ; when conqueror he had exacted from them unheard-of contributions, he had stripped them of fortresses and provinces. They, though their armies were now in possession of half France, did not demand of her the contribution of a single farthing, did not require the cession of a single acre of French territory—they were contented with claiming the restoration of those of their own provinces which he himself had wrested from them by victory, and of which it was but in accordance with the plainest common sense that defeat should in turn deprive him. And this was what grated on his selfish pride. He spoke of his own tarnished glory ; of the shame which he himself should feel at ruling over a diminished empire. And, rather than submit to this mortification of his personal vanity, he deliberately exposed France to all the misery of becoming the prey of triumphant and revengeful invaders, and to the

shame of twice seeing her capital in the possession of foreign conquerors.

Still, little as was true honour concerned in maintaining to the last his hopeless resistance, the brilliancy of his strategy in his last campaign was probably never surpassed by his grandest successes of former years. Once for a moment he gave way to despair, and sought a soldier's death on the field of Arcis-sur-Aube. But he was not so to fall. A few weeks before he had turned aside the remonstrances of one of his Generals, to whom he seemed to be courting destruction, by the reply that 'all our days were counted.' And his belief that fate watched over him may have been strengthened when he placed his horse in vain over a Prussian shell that had just fallen. His shuddering officers remarked to one another that 'he did it on purpose; he wished to end everything,' but the missile, though it exploded under the very legs of his horse, killed nothing but the poor animal itself, and left the rider unhurt, reserved for further and deeper humiliation.—(S. vii. 49.) 'Death,' as he said a few weeks later, when he had failed in an attempt to poison himself, 'death would not have him.'—(*ib.* 220.) Again our space forbids us to follow Ségur through his account of the brief but brilliant operations in Champagne, from which the only deduction which can be made by the most captious critic would be founded on his statement of the numbers of the armies engaged, for which he is as little to be trusted as an Imperial bulletin. Perhaps, too, we may think that he is hardly fair to Marmont and one or two other soldiers and statesmen, who, if they could not have averted the Emperor's fall, might, in his view, have shown a greater sympathy with the great man who was falling. A sympathy which does not dishonour himself, though we may feel a little wonder at the degree in which it makes him tolerate what he cannot deny to have been absolute despotism.

'Despotism, I allow, reigned over us; but it was a despotism of glory. And what founder of a dynasty, being at once a great statesman and a great warrior, has not been a despot? By what other genius but that of absolute power could Napoleon have raised France out of the abyss, first of madness, then of blood, and then of baseness, in which it was tossing about for nine whole years? How else could he have saved her from herself, and from invasion, and have raised her above all the thrones which at that time were combined for her destruction'—(vi. 209.)

We cannot but feel that there was something verging on the ridiculous ('du sublime au ridicule il n'y a qu'un pas')

in transferring this imperious, victorious, glorious despot to a petty isle, with a few thousand miners and quarrymen for his subjects—a couple of aides-de-camp for his court, and half a regiment for an army, and Ségur himself may be thought to have felt thus, since he passes over the short year of Elban sovereignty without notice; confining himself to pointing out the real reason which made Napoleon seem to acquiesce with such resignation in his expulsion from France, that he foresaw that it would not be long. Even before he embarked for his new kingdom—

‘he prophesied his return, founding his hopes on the attachment of the people of the Eastern provinces, and still more on that of the army, and laughing at the blindness of his foreign enemies, who, while casting him down from his throne, left him still within reach of it; and of his adversaries in France, who, by repudiating the tricolour, and re-establishing the white cockade, were identifying his cause with that of the Revolution. This blunder would bring him back many hearts. And he reckoned still more on the restlessness and love of change of the whole nation’—(vii. 220.)

With the first dethronement Ségur professedly closes his work. ‘The genius which had supported him disappears with Napoleon’—(*ib.* 223.) But among his last pages, one is specially interesting to an English reader, as containing a brief but not (considering the bitter antipathy of the author to everything that came from England) an uncandid portrait of the great British commander to whom his Emperor’s fall was so greatly attributable:

‘His antagonist was growing great in proportion to our misfortunes. Like most of the celebrated men who were his contemporaries, he had strongly marked features: a piercing look; a calm and contemplative physiognomy. His countrymen, it was said, were pleased to find in his manners and in his character all the national simplicity. But they remarked with less complacency in his reserved demeanour the same stiffness as in his disposition, and a dry and imperious laconicism in his language. Every one eulogised the equanimity of his temper; the judicial clearness of his perception; his scrupulous integrity; the justice and impartiality of his soul; his loyalty, unbending but cold, and absolute, like the duty to which he kept every one bound, and of which he made himself the slave. To hear them speak, this was the only power that he invoked, without ever employing praises, with which he scorned to excite his followers; without ever once appealing to their ambition, or even to their love of glory.¹ ‘This man of iron’ (a curious anticipation of

¹ M. de Brialmont, in his *Life of the Duke of Wellington*, points out, as a marked distinction between the principles of the Duke and those of Napoleon, that the latter, in his proclamations and addresses to his

the title of the Iron Duke) 'ruled all their wills. They admired his talents; they trusted in his good fortune. He reigned over their minds, if not by affection, at least by esteem.

'In our camp, in the eyes of those of our men who had encountered him, he was a methodical genius; circumspect, and coldly audacious. Not so much giving battle as receiving it, but receiving it in well-chosen positions, where the firmness of his infantry, and their superiority as marksmen, exhausted our attack, while it prepared the way for his own. In war, as he waged it, where he succeeded by methods the very opposite of ours, all was order and regularity, always carrying everything with him; insisting upon his troops having everything at command, that so he might always have them at his command. Obstinate in the conflict, in the moment of success he was free from elation. He has even been seen to stop short in the moment of victory, and, sacrificing the possibility of some further advantage to his habit of regularity, to leave our retreating forces time to recover finally. He was a fortunate general; fortunate sometimes in his antagonists, more often in their divisions, without reckoning his other advantages, such as the superiority of his soldiers as marksmen; the aid of the people whose country was the seat of war; the support of a fleet mistress of the sea; and the liberality of an inexhaustible treasury'—(vii. 207.)

At a later period he resumed his pen, retracing, in a somewhat unconnected strain, his recollection of some of the most important occurrences in France during the next thirty-five years. And in the first chapter of this continuation, which he calls an Appendix, he gives a brief but lively sketch of the conflict of feeling with which Napoleon's return from Elba was received by the majority of his old soldiers: by men of honour like himself, who had sworn allegiance to the restored dynasty, but could not forget the chief who had so often led them to victory. From this difficulty he conceived himself to be relieved by the flight of Louis XVIII., and, regarding his service as due to his country rather than to any particular sovereign, he did not hesitate to accept the post of chief of the staff of the force left as the garrison of Paris when Napoleon quitted the capital for his last field of battle. His absence from Waterloo excuses him, in his view, from giving any account of the day, when the fiery, brilliant genius, on which he and his comrades had so long placed their implicit reliance, was found unequal to a conflict with the more methodical and patient skill of the unconquerable antagonist to whom his most renowned lieutenant had previously yielded. According to one of the

soldiers, continually seeks to stimulate them by the prospect of glory, and never mentions duty; while Wellington appeals to the sense of duty, as the principle which alone ought to influence his army, and never once mentions glory.

greatest of them, Marmont, Napoleon's skill as a tactician was greatly inferior to his other military qualities: his deficiency in that branch of his profession being attributable to the rapidity of his promotion in his youth; since he became commander-in-chief of an army without ever having commanded a brigade, or even a battalion; while in nothing probably was Wellington's pre-eminence more undeniable than in the keenness and accuracy of his glance in action, and the promptitude and decision with which he handled his men under fire. Not indeed that Waterloo was in a great degree a battle of manœuvres: it was rather, as the Duke himself said more than once in the course of the day, one of 'hard pounding,' in which his men 'pounded the longest.'

Of Napoleon at St. Helena, Ségur says nothing. He had said enough to testify his deep sympathy with the greater humiliation of his second fall; but he could hardly respect the pettiness of soul displayed in his quarrels with Sir Hudson Lowe¹—he could hardly view with any feeling but shame

'the queller of the nations

Now daily squabbling o'er disputed rations;'²

and he could feel neither esteem nor sympathy for the obstinate combined falsehood and malignity with which, in the last weeks of his life, he sought to calumniate the royal victim whom he had murdered, and bequeathed a legacy to an assassin.

Not indeed that all his time at St. Helena was so ignominiously or unprofitably employed. In his parting address to his soldiers in 1814, he had promised them to employ his future leisure in giving an account of the great deeds which he and they had performed together. The promise, forgotten at Elba, was remembered at St. Helena. And we cannot refuse our respect to the versatility and diligence with which he solaced his enforced tranquillity by taking upon himself the new labours of an historian; not confining himself entirely to his own exploits, but devoting no small portion of his attention to an examination of the military achievements of others: of Cæsar, in whom he, no doubt,

¹ The whole question of Sir Hudson Lowe's conduct towards Napoleon, and that of Napoleon's complaints of him, were most elaborately discussed in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of January, 1855, by M. L. de Viel-Castel, in an article on Mr. Forsyth's work on the subject: and nothing can be more complete than M. de Viel-Castel's acquittal and vindication of the English Governor.

² Byron, *Age of Bronze*, 111.

recognised a genius akin to his own, since it was to a celerity of movement like his own that the great Roman owed the most brilliant of his triumphs; of Turenne, whom, by the mere selection of him, he seems to prove that he placed above all other commanders of French armies before himself; and of Frederick of Prussia, to whom he ascribes the merit of tenacity rather than of originality; and accompanying his narrative of their different operations with minute and lucid comments, which make these treatises manuals of instruction for the young soldier.

Once more, in one of his latest chapters, Ségur returns to his original subject. He was one of the few of Napoleon's Generals who survived to take a space in the imposing ceremony with which the Government of Louis Philippe, whom the English Ministry had permitted to remove the remains of the great warrior from St. Helena, committed them to a more appropriate resting-place in the Church of the Invalides in Paris. The noble Arch of Triumph, under which the funeral procession passed, seemed to the biographer's re-awakened enthusiasm 'far less triumphant than the indescribable spectacle of the countless heads, all uncovered, all respectfully silent, which thronged the approaches, the windows, the trees, the houses up to their very roofs.' And the dead body, which they assembled to honour, seemed also 'a thousand times more alive than the immense multitude thus united to contemplate it,' while 'the inanimate surroundings, the gigantic funeral car, the splendid altar on which the coffin rested in the Church, and even the magnificent Church itself,' irritated rather than soothed his pride in his old leader, by the reflection which it excited, 'how slight a proportion all these things, with their puerile grandeur, bore to the genius of which they seemed to pretend to represent the immensity'—(vii. 540.)

However adequate or inadequate the spectacle may have been, for a moment it rekindled in the Parisians much of their old enthusiasm for him in whom, when living, they had felt such pride and had placed such confidence. We, uninfluenced by the excitement of such a scene, and by the lapse of time equally removed from that bitterness of feeling which his relentless enmity towards our country provoked during his lifetime, may now judge him more dispassionately. As a soldier he confessedly stands, not only in the very first rank, but so high in that rank that in the whole history of war but one rival can be compared with him. As a legislator and ruler he displayed the abilities of a consummate states-

man; and, bringing both genius and resolution to the re-organisation of society and the re-establishment of law and order in his adopted country, he conferred benefits on France which can hardly be over-estimated, and which, probably, no other living man could have wrought out for her. Nor, in our estimate of his qualifications for government, may we pass over that force of character by which he bent or won over men of the most opposite dispositions and desires to his own purposes, or that keen penetration which enabled him on almost every occasion to discern the fittest instruments to carry out his designs. Yet, in spite of his possession of all these great and varied intellectual endowments, we can only reckon him among those whom Burke terms the 'great bad men.' Some allowance must undoubtedly be made for his age and country, coming to manhood as he did at a time when the demoralisation of every class in France had reached a pitch of which modern Europe affords no other example. But still we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, with every talent which can do honour to the head, he was singularly devoid of the more valuable excellences whose source is in the heart. Of virtues, however wide or however narrow may be our definition of them, few have been more completely destitute; and he had that worst of vices, an entire and absolute disbelief in the virtue of mankind in general. Shocked at nothing himself, he could not conceive that any crime by which they were not personally injured could shock others. He was not, like too many of his earlier contemporaries, cruel for the sake of cruelty, nor one who took delight in wanton bloodshed; but he was utterly indifferent to human suffering; and his justification of the massacre at Jaffa on the ground of the possible inconvenience which might have arisen to him from the release of his prisoners, argues perhaps a harder heart than even the deed itself. Sympathy with others he had absolutely none. His one invariable principle of action seems to have been selfishness; and no man was ever so impressed with the conviction, not only that he lived for himself alone, but also that every one else ought to live for his sake only. Magnanimity he had none—too brave to know personal fear, he had yet more than the suspicion and jealousy which is the proverbial weakness of despots: he trusted no one; he forgot and forgave nothing. What was perhaps his worst, as being his meanest failing, was his total want of truth and honesty. We do not speak of the different instances of his political treachery, but of his habitual disregard of truth, and of the

degree in which he required all his servants to disregard it. He sought to cheat foreign nations, his own subjects, and even his own ministers. His bulletins were false; his allegations of his motives were false; his excuses were false; and so inveterate was his habit of falsehood that it taints the Memoirs which he wrote in the calm solitude of St. Helena as deeply as his Correspondence, written in the hurry and excitement of constant action.

Still, being such as he was, both in good and evil, we cannot wonder at the power which in his day he obtained in France, nor even at the influence which his memory still exerts over no inconsiderable party in that country. His defects were exactly those which were most likely to be overlooked in a nation where utter selfishness had long been acknowledged as the sole principle of action among every class; where kings had laid down the maxim that falsehood and perfidy were among their most valuable privileges (certainly they were those which they least allowed to rust through disuse); and where an universal faithlessness had generated universal distrust; while the showy brilliancy of his unparalleled triumphs in war—when capital after capital was surrendered to or ransomed from his armies, and Paris was receiving constant embellishment from their spoils, was irresistibly attractive to its impulsive vanity. And, as these triumphs, however shortlived, fascinated the generation among which they were achieved, the recollection of them retains no small portion of power to this day; and if in the Senate, the army, and even among the peaceful citizens, a party still cherishes the hope of placing the young Napoleon on the throne occupied by his great-uncle, one of its strongest motives is a sort of indefinite hope that he may bring back to the nation the days of victory, and that another Jena or Dresden may efface the degradation of Sedan.

ART. VII.—THE OTHER WORLD.

The Other World; or, Glimpses of the Supernatural. Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L., Vicar of All Saints, Lambeth. 2 vols. (London: Henry S. King and Co., 1875.)

No small credit is due to the writer of these somewhat remarkable volumes, on the ground of the moral courage and

zeal which alone could have led him to put them forth. He must have foreseen the supercilious scorn and contemptuous pity, the sneers and ridicule to which he would be inevitably exposed in making a stand to defend that outwork of spiritual truth, which is now-a-days looked upon as so weak and untenable as to be unworthy of the serious attention and consideration of any philosophic mind.

To him it is plain that the doctrine of the Communion of Saints is no unmeaning phrase. Believing with all his heart that God, our heavenly Father, has knit together His elect in one communion and fellowship in the mystical body of His Son, the editor of these volumes (as he modestly calls himself, on the ground that his work is a compilation from various sources) has, for many years past, employed such leisure as he has, in receiving and sifting evidence of 'facts, records, and traditions relating to dreams, omens, miraculous occurrences, apparitions, wraiths, warnings, second sight, witchcraft, necromancy, &c.,' in short, to whatever bears upon, or, in any way, discloses to us the nearness of the unseen world, and gives us 'glimpses' of a state of things which, in the hurry and restless turmoil of modern life, there is a great temptation to forget, and which from time to time makes a momentary break in the clouds which usually surround us, thereby giving us to infer more than would be otherwise attainable, of what lies behind them. Accordingly, these volumes will be found to contain a very remarkable selection of examples of the supernatural (many of which are now for the first time made public), such as miracles, spectral appearances of departed spirits, providential warnings by dreams and otherwise, the intervention and ministry of good angels, and the persevering malignity of the Devil and his legions.

The result of Dr. Lee's labours is a work very different in character from the various collections of 'ghost stories' which, during the last few years, have found a place in circulating libraries and on railway stalls,—dreary trash, vamped up with wild theories and weak reasonings, though so far resembling them, that Dr. Lee's book has a cover as awful and ingeniously mysterious as that ghastly engraving which enshrouds Mrs. Crowe's *Night-side of Nature*.

We do not, however, quarrel with this. Dr. Lee's object is to be read; he desires that his book should have an extensive circulation, and that its contents should be thoroughly ventilated and examined by a class of readers who would not be likely to see it if it took brevet-rank as a 'library'

book. What was wanted was a popular volume which would find its way among those whose minds are being perverted by the infidel literature which is disseminated in so many works that are easily accessible. Whether Dr. Lee's book will succeed with this class is another matter. But he has evidently taken much pains, and the ground which he has striven to occupy gives scope for an important argument. Whether again his judgment is always sound in the cases which he adduces, or whether he is always right in the degree of credit he is disposed to give to evidence, we are not disposed to discuss. It is the subject itself which is interesting; he has taken it up in a serious spirit; and if our remarks both on it and on his book prove somewhat inconclusive, at all events some very curious phenomena will be cited and some serious reflections made.

Hitherto, the sceptical leaders have had matters very much their own way. Their exuberant laudation of themselves and their colleagues, and the attitude of contemptuous superiority which they are wont to assume, have successfully imposed upon many, to the destruction of their faith. Their undaunted confidence, 'We are they that ought to speak; we are the people, and wisdom will die with us,' and the more than Bolingbrookian flippancy which claims to have confuted everything at which it sneers, have told with woeful effect upon the many whom any novelty will attract; upon the shallow and the half-educated, upon the conceited, and those whose ambition it is to make themselves notorious; and upon the yet more numerous class who would be glad to break away from all *religious* obligation. Hence Mill found ready followers when he proclaimed his opinion that 'this world is a bungled business, in which no clear-sighted man could see any signs of wisdom or of God;' and Matthew Arnold also, when, out-running and out-daring the principles of his nurture, he wrote that 'the existence of a God is an unverifiable hypothesis;' and Congreve, when he asserted it to be a desirable thing to 'eliminate God from the minds of men.' And when, horror upon horror! another vile publication declared that the mission of its editors is 'to teach men to live without the fear of God; to die without the fear of the Devil; and to attain salvation without the Blood of the Lamb,' their statements were welcomed with acceptance and applause, and as Dr. Lee states upon his own knowledge, the work was 'circulated by thousands amongst the lower classes'—(ii. 236-7, note).

These deplorable works have been fully and fairly analysed.
VOL. IV.—NO. VII. O

swered ; but among the multitudes who have imbibed the poison, very few, it is to be feared, avail themselves of the antidote. Many are not aware of its existence ; many will not trouble themselves to resort to it. The works which have been put forth in answer to sceptical objectors, however able, are often hard, and dry, and above the capacity of those for whose use they are intended. The shot goes over their heads instead of hitting them.

It can hardly be otherwise. A child or a fool may, in few words, suggest a difficulty, which it would take volumes to answer. And, as a general rule, the readers of answers are not those who need to be convinced, but persons who, being convinced already, read, not with a view of weighing the arguments on both sides, and coming to a fair decision, but simply to strengthen themselves in opinions antecedently adopted.

The advantage of Dr. Lee's book is, that, to some extent, it opens a separate issue of a kind which is more likely to attract than to repel readers. Its disadvantage is, that no work of this particular kind can be wholly satisfactory ; and this for a reason which Johnson gave long ago. 'A man who thinks he has seen an apparition can only be convinced himself, his authority will not convince others.'¹

Men's minds are so differently constituted, that evidence which will bring conviction, and seem irrefragable, to one man, will have no great weight with another. Every juryman has had experience of this, and generally the obstinacy of his colleague, who has held out the longest, will seem no proof of his superior discernment. It does not, however, necessarily follow that where the fair amount of proof fails to satisfy, natural obtuseness, difficulty in following a train of argument, or the force of preconceived opinions, are the obstacles in the way of arriving at that which seems to ordinary minds the obvious conclusion. If, on the one hand, there are persons who cannot be brought to look at two sides of a question, and doggedly adhere, in their opinionativeness, to some pet theory, on the other hand there are persons who, whether from over-refining, or some other idiosyncrasy, not only adopt the Eldonian sentiment 'I doubt,' with respect to every question submitted, but (which the cautious old Chancellor did not) persevere in a conclusion in which nothing is concluded, or go wrong at last, out of the morbid dread of being swayed by some influence which, as they think, ought not to be permitted to weigh with them. Thus unbelief is often its own sorest

¹ Boswell's *Johnson*, Croker's edition, iv. 167.

antagonist, and in its anxiety to rise above prejudices, gets blinded by them.

In matters of religion, however, this perversion of judgment, which ends in 'the heart of unbelief' and in invincible opposition to the Truth of God, is not involuntary and irresistible (at any rate, at first), but owes its existence to some moral defect,—most commonly, perhaps, to that subtlest of snares, the pride of intellect. So long as humility and self-distrust go along with doubt, we can sympathise with and respect the doubter, but when arrogance steps in, and doubt is exalted as an evidence of intellectual superiority, we utterly distrust the speculations of the wise in his own conceits; 'for the wisdom which is from above is' not only 'pure,' but it is also 'peaceable,' and 'gentle,' and 'without wrangling and without hypocrisy,'—qualities which can hardly be said to be the predominating characteristics of the sceptical philosophy of the present day.

About a hundred years ago, Beilby Porteus, afterwards Bishop of London, but at that time of Chester, a kind-hearted, pious man, but no theological giant, preached a sermon in the Chapel Royal at St. James's, on the Causes of Unbelief. Its peroration, addressed to those 'who reject the Gospel,' was in these words:—

'Think whether you can boldly plead before the tribunal of Christ the sincerity of your unbelief as a bar to your condemnation. That plea may possibly in *some* cases be a good one. God grant it may in yours. But remember this one thing: that you stake your own souls upon the truth of it.'

Whether King George III. was present and heard the discourse, or whether its final words were repeated to him, we know not; but we were told by one who was much about the Court in those days that, on the next occasion when his Majesty saw Dr. Porteus, he saluted him thus:—

'What, what, my lord! do you teach that sincerity in unbelief may be pleaded as a bar to condemnation? Dangerous ground to get upon, my lord! And I don't believe one word of it. "Do, and you shall know." Obey the Gospel, and you will soon be sure whether it is true or not. If you do not make the experiment, you will be without excuse. That's my comment on your text.'

Our conviction is, that the King was right, and that no man will be allowed to fall into confirmed unbelief, who praying perseveringly for light and guidance in the way of truth, and keeping himself free from all known sin of flesh or spirit, walks humbly with his God. And where moral defects

like these exist, there is apparently no amount of evidence which will bring conviction with respect to the supernatural. At every step and stage of inquiry some objection may be raised, some difficulty suggested, which will afford a loophole for unbelief. Where there is the will, the way will not be hard to find; and where it is the will that is in fault, the excuse for unbelief is taken away.

But there is a circumstance growing out of the prevailing disposition to repudiate evidence with respect to the supernatural which must always affect narratives illustrating that subject, and which encourages mistrust in them; we mean the fact that the information very commonly fails at the precise point where, for the purpose of bringing conviction, it is most needed, and so the case breaks down, and becomes valueless, and only swells the number of tales set down as apocryphal. Facts are stated minutely, and often, no doubt, with perfect accuracy, but dates, names, and localities are suppressed. Nobody likes to have his word doubted, or to be subjected to cross-questioning, obviously carried on in the hope of detecting falsehood. And, of course, where the affections are concerned, this kind of treatment will be felt to be a sacrilegious trampling on holy ground, and something better than wounded pride resents the rough intermeddling of the stranger. The dread of this sort of treatment constrains to entire silence, or results in the restricted kind of information which destroys its evidential value. The writer has had his own experience on this point, and feels keenly the truth of these remarks.

In the preface to his work Dr. Lee expresses his 'regret, that in the publication of so many recent examples of the supernatural (about fifty), set forth for the first time in the following pages, the names of the persons to whom those examples occurred, and in some cases of those likewise who supplied him with them, are withheld.' The truth is, that there is such a sensitive dislike of publicity, and of the rude criticism consequent upon publicity, that very many persons shrink from the ordeal, and accordingly the book under review abounds with the requests of Dr. Lee's correspondents that their names and places of abode should be suppressed.

After dwelling in his first chapter on the materialism of the present age, he proceeds, in his second, to speak of the miraculous in Church history, combating first the arguments of Hume and kindred sophistries and fallacies on the subject of miracles, and then gives examples of the miraculous in the early ages of the Church, which at any rate have as direct

evidence in their favour as any event universally accepted in history. He instances the deliverance of the Thundering Legion (A.D. 174), 'attested by at least four independent Pagan writers, Dionysius Cassius, Julius Capitolinus, Ælius Lampridius, and Claudian.' Thence he passes to the luminous cross which appeared to Constantine; thence, in the fourth century, to the remarkable interposition which prevented the building of the Temple at Jerusalem by Julian; and next, in the following century, to the African miracle, when Hunneric, the Arian, cutting out by the roots the tongues of a congregation of Christians, the sufferers were, nevertheless, miraculously enabled to speak plainly. This last miracle, as is well known, has been disputed by Mr. Twistleton, on the ground that in a certain case, by the extraordinary skill of the operator, a tongue was removed with such dexterity, that the power of speech was not lost; and, therefore, it is argued, its retention by all the African confessors was an ordinary, and not a miraculous event.

'The Invention of the Cross' by the Empress Helena, which holds its place among the black-letter days of our Church's Calendar, on May 3, is another among the events commemorated by Dr. Lee. Few histories have been more sneered at as mere myths than this; yet, after a very careful investigation of the matter, the present writer, who started with a strong prepossession against it, has been unable to detect a flaw in the evidence, or any weak point to justify the rejection of it from the sphere of history.

Dr. Lee, indeed, after citing the miracles wrought by S. Basil, S. Athanasius, S. Jerome, S. John Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, and S. Augustine, as sufficient testimony to the fact that supernatural power was not lost in the Church immediately after the Apostolic age, as has been so frequently asserted, would even maintain its continuance to the present time.

The subject of miracles has been so fully entered upon in a recent number of this Review (No. 3, Vol. II., April 1876), that there is no need of reverting to it here. Dr. Lee has dealt with the subject very fairly; and although he can hardly expect to carry his readers all his length, it is to be hoped that he will induce some who have been accustomed, in an off-hand way, to allege that miracles have ceased since Apostolic times, to pause before they take upon themselves to deny that Almighty God has, from time to time, exhibited, for some wise and gracious purpose, His miraculous power; that to use our author's words, 'wherever the

Catholic religion has been taught and accepted, wherever the name of Jesus has been loved and venerated, wherever faith in the unseen has been active and daring, there the finger of God has been sometimes manifested'—(vol. i. p. 49).

Everybody that ever we heard of is quite convinced that many ecclesiastical miracles, so called, were *not* real miracles; that some were fictitious, and even, it is to be feared, deliberate impostures; that some were exaggerations and unintentional perversions of true facts; that some have been since explained by the progress of physical science; and that some are very transparent allegories, and originally were never meant for more. But, allowing for all these, there is still a residuum which cannot, with any amount of fairness, be relegated into either of these classes. It has been the way with sceptics and ultra-Protestants to assume that all alleged miracles in the Roman Church must of necessity be delusions, or falsehoods, or cheats, and that the believers in them must be blinded by ignorance, prejudice, or superstition; which is a very easy and sweeping, though by no means a reasonable or a charitable way of getting out of the difficulty. But can the hardest sceptic or ultra-Protestant among us really persuade himself that there are not thousands upon thousands of Roman Catholics just as acute and just as eager to arrive at the truth, and just as well able to discriminate truth from falsehood, as he is himself? Is he the one man whose perceptions are so shrewd and penetrating as to justify him in treating with contempt the steadfast belief of such men? But the Church of Rome and her priests so hamper thought! Granted, if you will. And they have so many invincible prejudices! Granted, if you will. And granted everything that you will, in that direction. Still the fact remains that for you, who are resolute in your unbelief, there are thousands of intelligent, earnest believers. But they have never examined the grounds of their belief in the supernatural; they have taken all upon trust. Say you so? What think you of such hagiographers as the Bollandists, for example? Since Héribert Rosweyde devised the *Acta Sanctorum*, and John Bolland, the Limburger, commenced the work, 245 years have elapsed. Every library in Christendom has been ransacked, every conceivable place whence information could be drawn has been visited, and its records examined with indefatigable pains and conscientious care. Some sixty closely-printed volumes have been the result, filled, more or less, with records of the supernatural. The calendars of January and February alone contain the histories of 1,480 saints, and those of the following months

are on the same scale. But the annals of the last quarter of the year are still incomplete; 'and,' say the Bollandists, who are now at their labours, 'the grandfathers are not yet born of the men who shall see the final completion of the *Acta Sanctorum*.' Now, can any man in his senses believe that the writers of these volumes have been so unscrupulous as to have been publishing lie upon lie, generation after generation, for two centuries and a half, without hesitation or compunction? or that men like Bolland, Henschen, Papenbroek, Tinnebroek, and the rest (some thirty in all)—men chosen as possessed of pre-eminently cool, calm, penetrating minds, would allow themselves to be led astray 'by old wives' fables,' or unite in a conspiracy to delude and deceive the world? But it will be said that the Bollandists were Jesuits. And what then? Is it to be supposed that because a man is a Jesuit, he surrenders himself wholly to the father of lies, and ignores the destiny awaiting 'whosoever loveth and maketh a lie?' Receive his assertions with as much caution as you will, search with minute care for errors and misstatements. Especially note where his judgment is liable to be warped, and he writes under the constraint imposed on him by the obligations of his order; but in Christian charity forbear from the supposition that every member of the Society of Jesus only lives to lie, and that he is a monster of hypocrisy and falsehood. Not *all* instances of the supernatural in the three-score volumes of the Bollandists can be fictions. Admit but a single instance of miracle recorded there to be true, and you may do what you will with the rest. *Cedit questio*. The principle is established.

Or again, in the two thousand pages of Alban Butler's most carefully expurgated hagiology, yet still full of 'signs and wonders and mighty deeds,' wrought by the Saints of God, is there no grain of truth? If ever honest pains were taken to discriminate between doubtful legends and true history, it is in that book. Is it to be assumed that a man working as conscientiously as Butler did, should, so soon as he approaches the subject of the supernatural, be given over to narrate 'lying wonders, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness?' We may be slow of heart to accept statements so little in accordance with the spirit of the age and the tone of popular Protestantism, but at least let us forbear from rude and coarse language on the subject, and from denying, on no better grounds than strong prejudice, things which men as godly and acute as ourselves have, after careful inquiry, satisfied themselves to be true.

It seems to be commonly assumed that the narratives of miracles accepted as genuine and authentic by the Church of Rome are neither reliable in their facts, nor properly attested; 'mere legends of the middle ages,' when it is supposed that all was in darkness; rumours resting on no authority; first moulded and then maintained by gross superstition. Dr. Lee has investigated for himself the principle of action in the reception of evidence and the decision of authority, which is taken at Rome with regard to such events and occurrences; and he gives it as follows:—

'The Congregation of Rites, which inquires into all miracles which demand sanction, is presided over by the Cardinal Vicar. It consists of twenty-one Cardinals of various nations, nine official prelates, nine consulting prelates of various nations, the fourteen Papal Masters of the Ceremonies, fourteen ordinary members, one secretary, one deputy-secretary, one notary, and keeper of the archives—in all, seventy people. Four miracles are required to be distinctly proved for Beatification; and two more for Canonisation. All these must be proved by eye, and not by ear-witnesses. In miracles where diseases have been cured, it is required, 1. that the disease must have been of an aggravated nature, and difficult or impossible to be cured. 2. That it was not on the turn. 3. That no medicine had been used, or, if it had, that it had done no good. 4. That the cure must be sudden. 5. That it must be complete and perfect. And, 6, there must have been no crisis. In the process of examination and inquiry, no step is taken, no doubt propounded, no fact allowed, without many members of the congregation being present; and a printed report is sent to all who may have been absent. Besides the ordinary cross-examinations, which are always of a most scrutinising character, it is the sole duty of one of the leading members of the congregation, the *Promotor Fidei*, as he is termed, to raise objections, and, if possible, to disprove every reported miracle. The members of this congregation are as keen, penetrating, and business-like, and have as complete a knowledge of the unconscious delusions of the human heart as any body of English jurymen. As ecclesiastical scholars they may be truly said to be equal to the same number of English barristers; and the head of the congregation, for shrewdness, acuteness of intellect, and judicial ability, is equal to any judge in England, who, by his interpretation of the law, and his particular sentence in a special case, wills away the life or property of any Englishman. . . . So sifting and careful has always been the investigation, that Alban Butler asserts, on the authority of Daubenton, that an English gentleman (not a Roman Catholic) being present, and seeing the process of several miracles, maintained them to have been completely proved and perfectly incontestable, but was astonished beyond measure at the scrupulosity of the scrutiny, when authoritatively informed, that *not one of those which he had heard discussed* had been allowed by the congregation to have been sufficiently proved'—(vol. ii. pp. 227-229.)

It is difficult to see what more could be done towards the establishment or rejection of any alleged fact than the course here described. And if a decision so arrived at be ignored, it appears to us that all historical evidence of every kind must go with it. Yet Mr. Lecky, in his work on the *Rise and Influence of Rationalism* (vol. i. p. 1), declares that 'at present, nearly all educated men receive an account of a miracle in their own day with an absolute and even derisive incredulity, *which dispenses with all examination of the evidence.*' That is to say, if Mr. Lecky's assertion be true, our educated men are as much influenced by the superstition of *defect*, as their uneducated forefathers may have been by that of *excess*. And we must take leave to say that the bigotry of the one is just as unphilosophical as that of the other. In reference, however, to the opinion expressed by Mr. Lecky, Dr. Lee gives this as the result of his own investigations: 'Though many are reticent, and many more shrink from publicity and rude criticism, it is known that the direct influence of the miraculous and supernatural is by no means unknown in the Church of England.' And he has adduced an instance of a miraculous cure at S. Madron's Well in Cornwall, into the circumstances of which Bishop Hall 'took a strict and personal examination'—a cure avouched 'by many hundreds of neighbours,' and with respect to which the Bishop was entirely satisfied that 'there was neither art nor collusion.'¹ Dr. Lee may have been right in his judgment: we have neither the means nor the desire to dispute it; but if it were a real miracle, we are constrained to say that it is the only manifestation of the kind which we have met with in any work of authority, and no other instance in modern times has come under our cognisance.

Obviously, if miracles were frequent, they would cease to be miracles. Their infrequency, however, among ourselves (to use no stronger term) is so marked, that it goes far to justify the common belief that they form no part of Almighty God's providential dealings with the Church of England. There may be no need for them; or we may not be worthy. And when Romanists object that this sign of a true Church is utterly wanting in us, while still reserving to ourselves the right to maintain that the assertion is not proven, and that even if it were, the conclusion thence drawn by them might be disputed, we believe that our best course is to say, Is it to be wondered at? And, considering the national temper at the present time, and the special efforts made on all sides to

¹ Lect. ii. 230-232.

depreciate and discredit the whole theory of supernatural interference, is it likely that the Almighty would not rather withdraw than multiply the evidences of His power, so as not to invite the irreverence and cavils of a gainsaying age? In the days of His flesh, there were places where our Blessed Lord 'could do no mighty work, because of their unbelief' (Matt. xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5, 6).

Meanwhile, it is a fact not generally remembered that in the seventy-second Canon of 1604, the Church of England distinctly did claim the power of Exorcism. That it is seldom or never exercised now is equally true, though Dr. Lee (vol. i. 58) states that—

'One of the most distinguished physicians in London recently assured him that, in his judgment, numerous peculiar and remarkable cases, both of epilepsy and madness, could only be duly and rationally accounted for by the Christian theory of possession, and declared that if the Church's spiritual powers on the one hand, and the virtue of faith on the other, were more commonly put into practice than they are, many cures, by God's blessing, might be looked for.'

Here, as so often is the case, no name is given. But Dr. Lee has the courage of his opinions, and his instances of successful exorcism and control over restless departed spirits are among the most curious portions of his book. The Petherick case, about two hundred years back, but very fully recorded, is a typical one. It is too long to be reproduced here, and to condense would be to destroy those turns of expression which give the strongest internal evidence of the perfect veracity of the simple-minded writer. The narrative, so far as we know, first appeared in *Hitchin's History of Cornwall* (vol. ii. pp. 548-51). The narrator was the Rev. John Ruddie, who, in 1665, was master of the Grammar School at Launceston, vicar of Alton, and a prebendary of Exeter. Dr. Neale introduced the account of the circumstances, so far as were then (1847) known, in his volume of *Communications between the Seen and the Unseen World*: and his comment on it is to the effect that while it is one of the most remarkable stories that had ever come under his cognisance, 'the very thing which spoils its interest' (Mr. Ruddie's silence as to the cause of the appearance of the spirit) makes one the more undoubtedly receive its truth. Dr. Lee has been fortunate enough to become acquainted with the contents of Mr. Ruddie's private journal; and this supplies all the *lacunæ* in the other document. Told in the briefest manner, the outline of the tale is this:—A young lad who was in the habit of

going daily from his parents' house in the country to the school at Launceston, becomes on a sudden 'pensive, dejected, and melancholy.' He ultimately reveals the cause. Day by day on his way to school, he is met by the apparition of a woman, whom he had known in life, but who has been dead for some years. He had taken courage to speak to her, but got no reply. The matter is told to Ruddle, not an incredulous man, but 'possessed of sturdy good sense; and the result is that he accompanies the lad and his parents to the place, and sees the apparition. The next day he goes alone to the same spot, and the ghost makes its communication. Upon this, he goes to Exeter, sees the Bishop (Seth Ward), obtains his permission to exorcise the spirit, returns home, has a further and fuller communication with it, proceeds to the house of an old profligate who had apparently been the seducer of the deceased woman, is the means of producing 'great horror and remorse; entire atonement and penance; ready to do whatever I enjoin; full acknowledgment before pardon.' He returns to the field, has a final interview with the ghost. 'Then I rehearsed the penitent words of the man she had come up to denounce, and the satisfaction he would perform. Then said she, "Peace in our midst." And the good man adds, 'I went through the proper forms,' and, 'with certain fixed rites, I did dismiss that troubled ghost, until she peacefully withdrew, gliding toward the west. Neither did she ever afterwards appear, but was allayed.'

The reader will, no doubt, wonder what were 'the proper forms of dismissal' and the 'fixed rites' to which the diarist alludes. Upon this point we are unable to throw any light. It is clear, however, from Mr. Ruddle's narrative, that, in the middle of the seventeenth century, published directions on such matters were in existence, and that he followed instructions which he must have looked upon as possessing some kind of authority. His first step is 'to find by my books what is expedient to be done, and then, "Apaga, Sathanas!"' He prepares for his interview with the departed spirit, and for subordinating it to his will, by measuring a circle on the grass and 'setting' his 'pentacle in the very midst;' fixing his 'crutch of rawn' (mountain ash) 'at the intersection of the five angles;' taking his station 'south, at the very true line of the meridian, and facing north.' And when the spirit appears, he opens his parchment scroll, and reads aloud the command, 'sounding out every syllable like a chant.' This process is repeated, 'and the third time I gave the signal in Syriac, the speech which is used, they say,

where such ones dwell, and converse in thoughts that glide.'—Knowing 'that the pentacle would govern her,'¹ and the ring must bind her till he spoke the word,' he calls to mind 'the rule laid down of old, that no angel or fiend, no spirit, good or evil, will ever speak until they be spoken to,' and so brings the matter to a conclusion. Evidently, the good man, in his simplicity or superstition, believed that there was virtue in 'the fixed rites' which he followed.

We need hardly say that, for ourselves, we believe nothing of the kind, any more than we believe that the spells of the Witch of Endor had power to bring up Samuel from his rest, or that smoke from heart and liver of any fish that swims has, in itself, as recorded in the Book of Tobit, a capacity of driving away demons; but we do believe that Providence may work, and has worked out its own purposes, using the follies and superstitions of men as its instruments. In the case before us, there seems no reason to think Mr. Ruddle's narrative is untrue, or that all the nonsense about circles and pentacles impugns his veracity, or made him an incompetent judge of what his eyes saw and his ears heard. For the rest, we admire the shrewdness of Bishop Ward, who, as Mr. Ruddle 'knelt before him to receive his parting benediction,' laid his hand upon his shoulder, and softly said, 'Let it be secret, Mr. Ruddle. Weak brethren! weak brethren!'

After some more cases of Exorcism,—one of very recent date, within our own Church—Dr. Lee's book proceeds to cases of stigmatisation, from the days of S. Francis of Assisi to our own, and all attested by evidence which he receives as conclusive in their favour, much of the evidence being that of medical men of distinguished character. Our limits, however, forbid our entering on a subject which, if touched on at all, requires the fullest and most impartial investigation. The facts in many cases are unquestionable. It is the *rationale* of them that is the point; and the mutual interaction of mind and body is not yet sufficiently understood to enable us to deny them the character of 'natural.'

And so we pass on to a chapter on dreams, omens, warnings,

¹ We believe that, ordinarily, this astrological instrument was a piece of fine linen, folded with five angles, and marked with cabalistic signs; but in this instance the device seems to have been traced out on the grass. It is a remarkable fact that the science (so to call it) of astrology lingered among men of education (the poet Dryden is an instance) and the clergy, long after it was generally repudiated among us. In a rural parish in Wiltshire, the baptismal register contains the nativities of the offspring of the principal parishioners calculated by an incumbent, who was a contemporary of Mr. Ruddle of Launceston.

presentiments, and second sight. It appears to us that Dr. Lee has chosen well and judiciously the instances he has given of dreams sent, or permitted, or, at any rate, undergone, if we may be allowed the expression. Our ignorance of the source of these communications is too profound to warrant our adopting with any certainty the two first words, and the last is used as implying that those of serious import are generally, one way or other, of a distressing nature, so that the dreamer shrinks from acting upon them, till they have been repeated. The great difficulty on the subject is to draw the line between what is natural and the mere result of circumstances in which the thoughts have been interested or engaged, and what is preternaturally impressed on the sleeper's conceptions. And this difficulty is increased when there is no obvious reason why the dream should have been sent to the particular person who experienced it, or when, to use an expression of Johnson, 'nothing came of it.' Now and then a dream and its fulfilment may be a remarkable coincidence, and nothing more; but there are many cases in which this solution is quite untenable.

The dreams recorded by Dr. Lee are as well authenticated as the circumstances will permit. They are all very remarkable, and we can find no reason why they should be discredited. As it appears to us, they were, each in its way, merciful interpositions of Providence to avert impending danger, to afford much-needed information, or to aid in the discovery of the perpetrators of crime, when such knowledge could be attained by no other means.

There is one dream the circumstances of which are more minutely recorded by Dr. Lee than by any preceding writer, and the whole thing is such a strange anomaly, and to all appearance so purposeless, that we will not pass it over. Why should the murder of Spencer Perceval, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by Bellingham, in 1812, have been specially revealed in a dream to a gentleman in Cornwall, and also (unless in the latter case there has been some error, which we half suspect) to another at York,¹ neither of them being in any way connected with the unfortunate victim, or with the politics of the day?

On the night of Perceval's assassination, Mr. Williams, of Scorrier House, near Redruth, dreams thrice that in what we knew as the lobby of the old House of Commons, he saw a man firing a pistol at a gentleman who had just entered it—

¹ Dr. Lee's account will be found vol. i. pp. 227-30. The other is in Mrs. Crowe's *Night-side of Nature*, p. 80.

this gentleman being the 'Chancellor.' At breakfast, next day, Mr. Williams can talk of nothing but his dream. He is so full of it that, riding over to Falmouth, he relates the circumstances to any friends whom he chanced to meet. On the evening of the day following he repeats the tale to a visitor, who makes the remark that the appearance of the wounded man had no resemblance to the 'Chancellor,' but that it had to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In answer to a very natural cross-examination, Mr. Williams affirms that he had never seen or had any communication with Mr. Perceval, and that never in his life had he been in the place which his description showed to be the lobby of the House of Commons. By-and-by, a son of Mr. Williams rides over from Truro, and brings intelligence of the assassination.

Six weeks afterwards, Mr. Williams goes up to town, and on entering the lobby identifies it as the place seen in his dream. He points out correctly the exact spot which Perceval had reached when struck by the ball, and where and how he fell. And the dresses both of Perceval and Bellingham he details with entire accuracy. Dr. Lee's narrative of this extraordinary event is attested as 'true and accurate' by the grand-daughter of Mr. Williams.¹

We must pass over some very remarkable instances of omens, warnings, presentiments, and of second sight, which it is difficult to class with accidents or coincidences, though we will say, in passing, that a case of second sight is within our own knowledge, of the truth of which we are absolutely certain, though, unfortunately, we have no authority to divulge the circumstances.

And thus we come to Dr. Lee's chapters on 'Spectral appearances of persons at the point of death; on perturbed spirits; and on haunted houses and localities;—in one word, to what are commonly called 'ghost stories.'

'It is wonderful,' said Johnson, on more than one occasion, and almost in the same words, 'that more than five thousand years have now elapsed since the creation of the world, and still it is undecided whether or not there has ever been an instance of the spirit of any person appearing after death. All argument is against it, but all belief is for it.'² And the words which he puts into the mouth of Imlac in his *Rasselas* probably represent his own opinion on the subject, and, in

¹ In the account of the similar dream at York, the dreamer (whose name is not given) is said to have gone off to London in consequence of it, but too late to prevent the catastrophe.

² Croker's *Boswell*, iv. 85 and 155.

spite of the sneer of his hard-mouthed editor (Croker) are the sentiment of a wise and pious mind, unable, it may be, to arrive at an absolutely certain conviction on the subject, but shrinking from speaking contemptuously of what *may* be true :—

‘That the dead are seen no more I will not undertake to maintain, against the concurrent and unvaried testimony of all ages and of all nations. There is no people, rude or learned, among whom apparitions of the dead are not related and believed. This opinion, which prevails as far as human nature is diffused, could become universal only by its truth; those that never heard of one another would not have agreed in a tale which nothing but experience can make credible. That it is doubted by single cavillers can very little weaken the general evidence; and some who deny it with their tongues, confess it by their fears.’¹

One thing is quite clear. If those who have departed from this world ever return to it, it can only be by Divine permission or command. To give a different application to well-known words, ‘between us and them there is a great gulf fixed, so that on all ordinary occasions they cannot pass to us that would come from thence.’ But this is not all; we have no scriptural grounds for supposing that the disembodied spirit, as such, is clothed with any form resembling that which it wore on earth. ‘A spirit,’ said our Blessed Lord (Luke xxiv. 39) ‘hath not flesh and bones.’ If a revenant, however, does not ‘assume both form and suit,’² it would not be recognisable by those who were its intimates on earth. And if there is to be communication by speech, there must be a voice with tones not unlike those of old, and this, without the muscular apparatus by which speech is produced. And, moreover, in those terrifying apparitions in which the murdered person presents himself in the ghastly condition in which life was destroyed, it must be permitted that there should be the verisimilitude of the victim. Yet, since the abstract idea of a spirit certainly implies that it has neither substance, form, shape, voice, nor anything which can render its presence visible or sensible to human faculties, if it does appear visibly, God has permitted the apparition for some express purpose, and enabled it to produce upon our vision the impression of the fleshly aspect which it wore before it descended to ‘its wormy bed.’ Or else we must adopt the theory of Walter Scott in his letters on *Demonology and Witchcraft*, that ‘imagination, favoured by circumstances, has power to summon up to the organ of sight, spectres which only exist in the mind of those

¹ Croker's *Boswell*, i. 332-3.

² *Twelfth Night*, act v. scene i.

by whom their apparition seems to be witnessed ;' or, with Sir David Brewster,¹ in his letters on *Natural Magic*, adopt the opinion of Dr. Hibbert, who assigned all spectral appearances to disordered vision, usually arising from some form of

¹ We would refer the reader to Dr. Brewster's second letter, in which he dwells on the eye as the most fertile source of mental illusions ; and his third letter, on the subject of spectral illusions, contains the most remarkable case upon record—that of 'Mrs. A,' resulting from the poor lady's state of health. We ourselves, many years ago, knew an instance of the same kind, though of very inferior interest. A married woman, strong-minded, untroubled with 'nerves,' and a rigid self-disciplinarian, was haunted by the apparition of a large dog, of unnatural hue, whenever she was in a state of pregnancy. This circumstance at once satisfied her of the spectral nature of her visitant, and she soon grew quite indifferent to its presence, which was always withdrawn after the birth of her infant. Now, though Sir David's theory satisfactorily explains cases of this kind, and removes them from the atmosphere of the supernatural, where only *one* person is concerned, it breaks down utterly as a solution of the mystery where the same apparition presents itself identically to two or more, who are wholly independent of each other, and have no knowledge of what has occurred to the other spectators of the spectre, as in the ghastly Australian incident, of which an outline was committed to writing by a clergyman of unimpeachable veracity in 1864, and authenticated at the same time by several gentlemen then resident in Sydney, and who were present at the trial. A well-to-do settler—a bachelor—suddenly disappears. His nearest neighbours and most intimate friends—two brothers—surprised at his absence without communicating with them, inquire of the man-servant at his residence, and are led to believe that in consequence of letters from home he had sailed in great haste for England. Not satisfied with the servant's manner, one of the brothers, the younger, rides into Sydney. There had been a sudden change of weather after a long season of storm. There was a hurried rush of passengers to the ships about to sail, and it was possible that this gentleman *might* have embarked. At any rate no tidings could be heard of him. A few days afterwards, the elder brother rode into Sydney to a dinner engagement, and did not return till late, and then in a state of extreme agitation. His sister, who had sat up to admit him, inquired the cause. He would tell her nothing ; but promised to do so hereafter. The next day the two brothers (the elder maintaining an absolute silence) rode into Sydney, and dined there. They both returned before midnight—both in extreme distress, and their horses palpitating with terror. This was the explanation. The night before, the horse of the elder brother started. The rider, looking round, sees his missing neighbour resting against some palings, with nothing on but a night-shirt, and his throat cut from ear to ear. The apparition pointed to a sheep-pond in a field behind him. To no human being had he revealed the sight. On the night following both brothers had witnessed the same appalling object. Satisfied that there had been foul play, on the next day they engaged a native (a human bloodhound in the faculty of smell) to aid in the search. He is put on scent at the rails, tracks it to the pond, and after wading about, plunges his spear into something which is raised with difficulty, and turns out to be the body of the murdered man. The servant, a convict, had committed the crime ; and for it, he was tried, condemned, and executed. It may be added that when the corpse which he had supposed to be safely

dyspepsia ; or, with Dr. Wynter, in his Essay on *Brain Difficulties*, make a little additional phosphorus in the brain, or of carbonic acid in the blood, the causes of mental delusions.

It may be remembered that Sir Walter Scott, at the close of his letters on *Demonology and Witchcraft*, touches upon what he calls 'accredited ghost stories.' And of these he alleges that 'they want evidence ;' and as coming under this head he especially mentions the Lyttelton, the Wynyard, the Beresford and the less known Hinton story, where Earl St. Vincent and a friend watched the so-called 'haunted' house (which his sister Mrs. Ricketts rented) without any satisfactory result. 'This last,' he says, 'is told as a real story, with a thousand different circumstances.' 'But who,' he asks, 'has seen an authentic account of the circumstances ?' Such a document has been in the writer's possession for many years, and his own judgment on it has always been that there was abundant cause why the house should have been haunted, but that there were mysteries unexplained which make it a perplexing history. Not so with respect to the Lyttelton, Beresford, and Wynyard apparitions. Dr. Lee has presented them in a form which sufficiently establishes their truth. In the first-named case the late lamented Lord Lyttelton allowed Dr. Lee to transcribe from the originals in his lordship's possession the family records on the subject. It is much to be desired that others who possess documents of similar character would follow that excellent nobleman's wise and liberal course. A reference to Dr. Lee's second volume will show that he has found the *sufficient evidence* for the Beresford and Wynyard histories which Sir Walter Scott affirmed to be wanting. Considering how very large an element the supernatural forms

hidden, was suddenly brought before him by the brothers, and he was directly charged with the murder, he made no attempt to defend himself.

Now, if the elder brother only had seen the apparition, and come home and stated what he believed himself to have seen, a Brewster might have attributed the sight to an unwholesome dinner, and disturbed digestion ; though that would not solve the difficulty as to the horse's condition. But when the younger brother, wholly unaware of what his brother had seen the night before, witnesses the same sight (repeated to the elder a second time), both the horses being at the same time stricken with a deadly panic, we must confess that the Brewsterian theory, however philosophical, does seem utterly to fail ; and to accept the supernatural in cases such as these seems to us to involve a far less heavy strain on our belief than it would be to accept the philosophical.

At p. 61, vol. ii. of Dr. Lee's work, a not very dissimilar tale to the above is given ; but they are certainly not identical, though the locality of both is Australia. But Australia, as might be expected, has many kindred records.

in Sir Walter's works, the volume from which we have quoted has always seemed to us (although written in an excellently reverent and humble spirit) as rather expressing popular notions than his own private opinions, and as drawn up in a style which would be more pleasing to the son-in-law (Lockhart), to whom the letters were addressed, than to himself.

Dr. Lee's other instances of spectral appearances seem to us very well chosen. Many of them are now published for the first time. He dwells, too, on examples of apparitions at the time of death to friends and relations, as being very numerous: but we think he might have gone further and said that of all examples they are the *most* numerous. We are persuaded that there are very few persons who have any family traditions, who cannot recall the tale of some ancestor or kinsman, who, though known to be thousands of miles away, has, at the moment of his departure out of this life, glided into the presence of a relation to whom he was very dear—a son appearing to his mother, or a brother to his sister, or the like, permitted so to prepare them for a coming sorrow, and to remind them of the loving Providence which orders and tenderly watches over all. The fact is that *this* class of what are called 'ghost stories' is so numerous, and so thoroughly well authenticated, that the hesitation would rather be as to whether they be properly *supernatural* at all. We mean that the question arises whether it may not be possible in the nature of things—under certain circumstances—for the departing spirit to manifest itself to distant friends at the instant, the fleeting moment, of transition from this world to the other? If any one replies, If so why is it not even *more* common? our answer is easy. There are numbers of things quite natural which are much *more* uncommon than the well-ascertained instances of this class of event.

In the house in which these pages are written, a tall and wide staircase-window, with a northern aspect, throws a strong side-light on the entrance into the chief living-room, which stands at the end of a passage running nearly the length of the house. It was after midday, in midwinter, many years since, that the writer left his study, which opens into the passage just mentioned, on his way to his early dinner. The day was rather foggy, but there was no density of vapour, yet the door at the end of the passage seemed obscured by mist. As he advanced, the mist, so to call it, gathered into one spot, deepened, and formed itself into the outline of a human figure, the head and shoulders becoming more and more distinct, while the rest of the body seemed enveloped in a

gauzy cloaklike vestment of many folds, reaching downwards so as to hide the feet, and, from its width, as it rested on the flagged passage, giving a pyramidal outline. The full light of the window fell on this object, which was so thin and tenuous in its consistency that the light on the panels of a highly varnished door were visible through the lower part of the dress. It was altogether colourless, a statue carved in mist. The writer was so startled that he is uncertain whether he moved forward or stood still. He was rather astonished than terrified, for his first notion was that he was witnessing some hitherto unnoticed effect of light and shade. He had no thought of anything supernatural, till, as he gazed, the head was turned towards him, and he at once recognised the features of a very dear friend. The expression of his countenance was that of holy, peaceful repose, and the gentle kindly aspect which it wore in daily life was intensified (so the writer, in recalling the sight, has ever since felt) into a parting glance of deep affection. And then, in an instant, all passed away. The writer can only compare the manner of the evanescence to the way in which a jet of steam is dissipated on exposure to cold air. Hardly, till then, did he realise that he had been brought into close communion with the supernatural. The result was great awe, but no terror, so that instead of retreating to his study, he went forward and opened the door, close to which the apparition had stood.

Of course, he could not doubt the import of what he had seen, and the morrow's or the next day's post brought the tidings that his friend had tranquilly passed out of this world at the time when he was seen by the writer. It must be stated, that it was a sudden summons; that the writer had heard nothing of him for some weeks previously, and that nothing had brought him to his thoughts on the day of his decease. The writer has no more to tell. The reader will believe or disbelieve the tale, as he chooses. The writer never crosses the spot where the figure stood but imagination reproduces the scene; but it has no element of pain or fear. We can have no doubt that many such cases remain untold, and for the very obvious reason that they who have been thus brought into communication with the world beyond the grave can never feel themselves quite in the same condition with those who have not; and the consequence is, of necessity, a certain instinctive shrinking from all needless speech upon the subject—a reserve in laying it open to those who have not had a similar experience, especially in a case like that just

narrated, where the affections were deeply concerned; and where, as the writer believes, the forewarning was mercifully granted, by way of preparation against a shock which, otherwise, would have been very overwhelming.

We do not propose to follow Dr. Lee in his chapter on 'Haunted Houses and Localities.' The subject is full of difficulties both physical and theological, so many and so great, and requiring such careful handling, that, to tell the honest truth, we do not feel ourselves capable of entering upon it. A single ill-chosen word, where every sentence written involves a grave responsibility, might seem to advocate some questionable or even unsound opinion. We are not thinking of the cavils and objections of those who repudiate all belief in the supernatural, but of reverent, thoughtful readers, who are seeking guidance along a very dim and difficult way. It is safest to leave mysteries where we find them, and not to theorise in any matter connected with the supernatural, where absolute certainty of conclusion is, and on this side the grave, must continue to be, unattainable.¹

The concluding chapters of Dr. Lee's work (and, in some respects, the most valuable portion of it) contain an exposure of the dangers of, and a most earnest protest against, the wickedness of modern Spiritualism. What we have to say on that subject may be said very shortly.

Spiritualism is either an imposture, or a reality, or a mixture of both. Whichever it be, Christian principle must denounce any connexion with it, *in any way*, as a real sin; and the more we believe in Spiritualism as a real agency, and not as an imposture, the greater does the offence become. We presume that it is no incorrect definition of Spiritualism (or to give it its old name, *necromancy*) to describe it as 'the art of communicating with devils, and of doing surprising things by means of their aid; particularly that of calling up the dead and extorting answers from them.'²

Now, supposing the whole system to be a structure of deceit, more or less cunningly devised, the actors in it and abettors of it bring themselves under condemnation, as guilty of devising *falsehood* for the purpose of entrapping the ignorant and unwary. On the other hand, if men have really the power of doing what the Spiritualists profess to be able to do,

¹ If the reader has never fallen in with the story of the haunted house at Willington (near Newcastle-on-Tyne), we strongly recommend it to his perusal. It will be found in Howitt's *Visits to Remarkable Places* and in Mrs. Crowe's volume, pp. 336-353.

² *Glimpses of the Supernatural*, ii. 183.

then their act is stringently forbidden, both in the Old and in the New Testament. In the Old, *witchcraft*, or dealing with familiar spirits, is made a capital offence.¹ In the New, *witchcraft* (*φαρμακεία*) is classed with works of the flesh;² and in the Apocalypse, the *sorcerer* (*φαρμακὺς, φαρμακὸς*) is allotted his portion in the lake of fire;³ and in both passages is united with him 'whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.' So clear and explicit is the teaching of Scripture on this subject that there is but one way of getting over it, and that is by getting rid of the authority of Scripture, which is done accordingly.

As regards the mere conjuror's tricks of raps, and taps, and table-turning, and 'spirit-writing' so called, which have been exposed again and again, and which of late have even come before the law-courts, we do not care to speak. Our readers will not desire it, and no exposure would disturb the convictions of a thorough-going spiritualist. And the oracles of these deliberate cheats are as worthless as their tricks.⁴ It would be inconceivable that such trash should be listened to, or accepted, did not all experience show that where folks are willing to be deceived, the opportunity will not be wanting; if they are eager to believe a lie, their hearts wax gross, and they are given over to the delusions they have loved. Conceive the state of a man's mind who could believe that the spirit of some one whom God had taken to Himself should

¹ Exod. xxii. 18; Deut. xviii. 10; Levit. xx. 27, &c.

² Gal. v. 20.

³ Rev. xxi. 8; xxii. 15.

⁴ In a leading article in the *Evening Standard* for an early day in June of the past year (1876) we read as follows: 'A Mr. Morse, who is described as a trance medium, gave "an inspirational address" a few days ago, and at the *séance* his "controlling spirit" was supposed to be very communicative. "I am the Strolling Player," the spirit is reported to have said, "or at least after all I have gone through lately—what is left of me, whittled down to a fine point. A point has no extension, so I may call myself a mathematical ghost." "One good turn deserves another," as the cat said when she was under the rollers of the mangle, and as our philosopher has worked one-half of the medium's brain in giving you one address, now I come in to work the other, and to say a little about scandal-mongers. I know people who are very catlike. Stroke them down, they purr and mee-ow, and look like a number one angel; but show them a mouse, their eyes flash, their tails cock up, their claws come out, and they look as if they mean business." This and much more in the same strain is solemnly put forward as the utterances of one who has passed the gates of death, and it is apparently expected that the report will convince the incredulous of the truth of Spiritualism and the mighty power of spirit media. . . . Anything more wildly and wickedly absurd surely cannot be imagined; and it is a remarkable thing that the same utter vulgarity of tone is traceable throughout the communications of all the "spirits."

return to this world for the purpose of making a revelation delivered in words written backwards!¹

The most remarkable part of the matter is that among the prominent adherents of Spiritualism we read the names of some who are notorious inculcators of infidelity, and of others who are considered great authorities in medical and other sciences,—one more especially (occasionally referred to by Dr. Lee), who has lately been as miserably as conspicuously mixed up with a mysterious tragedy of the darkest type, is evidently a man of singular astuteness and self-possession.

For anything that has hitherto appeared to the contrary, these gentlemen are as well disposed to accept the most transparent trickeries of Spiritualism as those more terrible features of the system which Dr. Lee describes as an intentional surrender of the will to the Evil One: 'an invocation of evil spirits for unlawful purposes, a "willing" for supernatural intervention in things not lawful, and a deliberate turning away from Him to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth.'

The credulity of the Spiritualists seems inexhaustible; but still, after the most careful and (we trust) impartial examination we have been enabled to give to the subject and its evidence,—short of attending their *séances* (of which the lawfulness may well be questioned), we have arrived at the opinion that to seek information through the instrumentality of a *medium* may be a proceeding of no negative character; that there are cases in which they who have so tampered with forbidden agencies² have been directly deluded by the Evil One in those signs and wonders in which there has been no imposture or delusion; and, further, that in the communications with the unseen world, which are the object of the

¹ See Mr. Wallace's letter to *The Times*, reprinted by Dr. Lee, vol. ii. p. 193-7.

² Spiritualism has, in one case lately brought under the eye of the public, an aspect so truly revolting, and so suggestive of the evil purposes to which it may be turned, that we feel we ought not to shrink from alluding to it. In the report in the *Evening Standard* of October 21, 1876, of the Slade investigation at Bow Street, a male witness, detailing an abominable outrage committed on him during a *séance*, stated that he was asked by Dr. Slade whether he 'liked' such usage, and upon his answering in the negative, Dr. Slade's remark in reply (as given in the newspaper) was, that 'most people do.' So far as we have seen, the public press made no comment on this atrocious assertion. We should be glad to believe that this portion of the evidence was misunderstood by the reporter; but on such a point a reporter was not likely to be inaccurate.

séances, evil spirits have sometimes personified the souls of the departed who are nominally invoked.

One note-worthy circumstance in confirmation of the judgment here expressed is this—that not only has nothing worthy to be revealed, nothing suggestive of the deep things of God, and the more solemn mysteries of Revelation, nothing bearing the stamp of the pure and exalting spirit of the Gospel, found its way into any of these communications from the unseen world. All that is not inane, futile, and childish to the last degree,—all that, in Professor Huxley's phrase, is not 'twaddle,' is, wherever religion is concerned, for the most part, an enunciation of unsound, heretical, and even blasphemous doctrine, of the wildest type of ignorant heterodoxy; and this especially in America.

But, secondly, if, as its adherents allege, Spiritualism is a development of intercourse between those who are still in this world and those who have been called out of it, and if Spiritualism be not (which, however, it is) antagonistic to Christianity, should we not have anticipated that its disciples would have given the greatest prominence to the Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints, and have referred to this new phase of human experience as a visible proof that God has knit together His elect in one communion and fellowship in the mystical Body of His Son? Would they not have pointed to the Creeds as testifying to the truth of their opinions? Yet, so far as we have been able to ascertain, in all the multiplied revelations which are alleged to have arisen from this intercourse between the living and the dead, there has never been the smallest value set upon this great Christian privilege, nor, in fact, is the doctrine ever referred to. If our generation had really received such a gift from the Father of mercies, and God of all comfort, as the Spiritualists claim to possess, would no voice have been heard of exulting acknowledgment and thankfulness for the blessing now conferred on the Church of God, of being able to communicate directly with the 'general assembly of the first-born which are written in heaven,' and with 'the spirits of just men made perfect'?

But, further, we have positive evidence of the source of these communications. Whenever the spirit then present has been adjured in the most Holy Name to declare its nature, it has confessed that it is *evil*. And, on one most remarkable occasion recorded by Dr. Lee, a clergyman (intimately known to him) having long declined to be present at, or take part in a *séance*, was ultimately (and, as we think, ill-advisedly) induced to attend one. He was, before long, 'so shocked and

horrified at what he beheld,' and 'so firmly convinced that what he witnessed was the result of invocation and intervention of evil spirits,' that he solemnly protested against the crime which was being perpetrated. Apparently without effort, he was spoiling the sport. He then 'made a mental act of faith,' and prayed silently, 'If this be the work of evil spirits, may God Almighty, for Christ's sake, stop it.' The result was that all the devilry which was going on was brought to an abrupt conclusion. The spirits slunk away, or remained powerless. The clergyman's heart was hot within him, and he felt himself constrained to make another 'earnest exhortation.' He would have been wiser, as we think, if he had withdrawn without a word, for he was casting pearls before swine, the result being that some of his audience proceeded to maintain that 'Spiritualism was destined to and would soon take the place of Christianity.' The eighth and ninth chapters of Dr. Lee's book contain several equally striking narratives, which, if accepted, can leave no doubt that the powers exhibited in Spiritualistic *séances* (conducted under the determination to obtain exhibitions of them) are from beneath and not from above.

So far, therefore, the clever sceptics, who hold the Scriptures in little estimation, but, with Mr. Wallace, are satisfied that 'the main facts of Spiritualism are well established,' are *right enough*. There *is* a power present which is superhuman : so much as that they assert. That which they deny is that such power emanates from God. And herein we agree with them again. If Spiritualism were of God, it would be spiritual in its character, an instrument devised by Him for the increase of communion with Himself. Of such spiritual-mindedness we can find no trace. Well would it be if the characteristics of the system were only of the earth, earthy. But it wears a far worse aspect. As there was no connexion in the old heathenism between religion and morality, so in the new spiritualism which is only its modern development (which its adherents tell us is to supersede Christianity) the fear of the Lord is not the beginning of *its* wisdom, nor is the holiness which He enjoins the principle which it inculcates. There can, unhappily, be no question as to the direction towards which Spiritualism is tending.

Some of those who, slighting or rejecting the Scriptures, have adopted Spiritualism as their creed, are men eminent for their attainments in science : the world is indebted to them for great and valuable discoveries, and we are likely to be yet further their debtors. But they never seem to consider that

anything lies beyond their own immediate domain. They are their own centre and circumference. From the overbearing tone of their writings, they appear to hold that all men are beneath them; and that there is nothing above or beyond them. If what they have acquired with so much credit to themselves, and benefit to others, had but suggested to them, that their all, at most, is very little, they would be of another spirit. As it is, they bring Bacon's apothegm back to us very painfully: 'It is true that a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism; but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion.'¹

It was said by Charles the Second, of Isaac Vossius, the most credulous and incredulous of men, 'There is nothing which he refuses to believe, except the Bible.'² The credulity and incredulity of our modern philosophers are not less remarkable. 'If men,' wrote Dr. Neale, 'will not believe in God's miracles, the necessity of believing *something* leads them to give credit to the devils.'³ Or, as it has been still more tersely put, 'they have given up believing in nothing, and have taken to believe in the Devil.'

We have little more to say on the subject of the supernatural. The so-called laws of nature (a very objectionable phrase in any other sense than as describing the divine constitution which Almighty God has willed to give to things and persons) are, in their ultimate relations, far beyond the limits of our knowledge. Only of this we are quite sure, that the world of nature is a vast region, into which the further we penetrate, the wider spreads before us the region of the unexplored. And yet each advance of science, while it deepens the sense of mystery which hangs around the ultimate relations of things, does but strengthen the conviction that both what we know and what lies shrouded from our ken are truly portions of one concatenated and consistent whole; both under one Lord; both under one Law-giver. Some of these are more familiar to us than others. The veil which shrouds what we call supernatural phenomena is, when

¹ *Essays*, xvi.

² It has been supposed that Shaftesbury was thinking of Vossius, when he says (*Characteristics*, vol. i. 345), that he can produce authors who, if they want Christian faith, can make amends by a Chinese or Indian one, and though Christian miracles may not so well satisfy them, they dwell with the highest content on the prodigies of Moorish and Pagan countries.' But there have never been wanting those in every age, who with great abilities have abused them by derogating from the power, wisdom, justice, or love of Him Who gave them.

³ *Unseen World*, p. 196.

God sees fit, lifted up for a moment. But this involves no violation of law. It only shows that our knowledge of the laws themselves is incomplete, and that what we call 'nature' stretches beyond the limits of our present experience, into a region usually out of sight—a higher atmosphere in that system of order which is regulated by Him, who is God over all, blessed for ever.¹

'Darkly we move, we press upon the brink
Haply of viewless worlds, and know it not;
Yes, it may be, that nearer than we think
Are those whom death has parted from our lot!
Fearfully, wondrously, our souls are made,
Let us walk humbly on, but undismayed!
Humbly, for knowledge strives in vain to feel
Her way amidst these marvels of the mind;
Yet undismay'd, for do they not reveal
Th' immortal being with our dust entwined?'²

ART. VIII.—CHARLES KINGSLEY.

Charles Kingsley: His Letters, and Memoirs of his Life.

Edited by HIS WIFE. In two volumes. (Henry S. King and Co., 1877.)

IT is apparently becoming the usual practice for the biographies of leading men deceased, especially of clergymen, to be written, or at least edited, by their widows. The present memoir has been preceded by quite a number of similar publications; so that, to judge from appearances, there is some risk lest an undertaking to write a memoir of the 'dear departed' should come to be recognised as an integral part of the marriage-vow, thus adding a new terror to matrimony; which tendency on the whole we must regard as a mistake. A wife, if she is possessed of adequate literary skill, may indeed portray certain aspects of her husband's character better than any one else. She may describe his home life, and tell what he was as husband and father. But that is a very small part of what the great outside public desires to

¹ See an admirable article on the Supernatural in Blunt's *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*.

² Felicia Hemans, *Records of Woman*, 269.

know, and has, in a certain sense, the right to know, about him. The wife would be probably unwilling, and is almost certainly unable, to tell the complete truth about the husband, considered in his function, whatever it be, towards the public. A man's career, with its difficulties and struggles, can be only very partially comprehended or described by one who does not share that career; and it seems to us that a continuance of this habit of feminine biography can issue only in a succession of works more or less defective in conception, in which the broader and more manly aspects of character are inadequately represented, if not altogether forgotten, and in whose pages the fearless and unsparing criticism which will occasionally be needed upon every man's life and actions cannot, in the very nature of things, be looked for.

It must not be thought, however, that although the work before us, by the widow of the late Canon Kingsley, has been the occasion of our remarks upon what we see is a growing practice, it is in itself unusually open to animadversions of the kind we have suggested. The fact is quite otherwise. It is a work in many ways praiseworthy of its kind. We believe it is no secret that the late Canon held all his literary interests very much in common with his wife. During many years of their married life she acted as his secretary and amanuensis, and how highly he thought of her judgment appears from many passages in his correspondence. Probably there are few ladies so well qualified to undertake a work of this kind as the editor of the present volumes. And, furthermore, she has to a certain extent avoided the danger of inadequacy by making her work rather a collection of materials for a biography than the biography itself. All these masses of letters through which Mr. Kingsley is made to utter himself are really of the nature of *Mémoires pour servir*; and the brief pages of narrative which form the setting of the letters are, from a literary or critical point of view, utterly inadequate. To us of this generation who knew the man, a gossipy, desultory, superficial book, such as Mrs. Kingsley has given us, is congenial and welcome enough; but should it prove that some two or three of Charles Kingsley's works have the same charm for a new generation which they have exerted upon this,—and we think, upon the whole, that this is to be looked for—then some vigorous writer will probably seize and disembowel these amorphous masses of biographical 'stuff'; and rejecting three-fourths of them, will incorporate the remainder in a thoughtful and vigorous estimate of the strength and the weakness, the high ideals

and the fatal gaps, in Charles Kingsley's religious belief and the practical aims to which his life was devoted.

He seems to have been a clever, desultory, idle boy. 'Not a close student,' Mr. Derwent Coleridge, his old master, euphemistically calls him; and the Rev. R. C. Powles follows suit with 'he would work hard by fits and starts—on the eve of an examination, for instance; but his industry was intermittent and against the grain.' He was 'a tall, slight boy,' says Mr. Coleridge, 'of keen visage, and of great bodily activity, high-spirited, earnest and energetic.' Natural history was then, as in later life, his passion. For botany and geology he had an absolute enthusiasm. Whatever time he could spare he gave to these. 'He liked nothing better,' says Mr. Powles, 'than to sally out, hammer in hand and his botanical tin slung round his neck, on some long expedition in quest of new plants, and to investigate the cliffs within a few miles of Helston.' He was not fond of games, and was not expert at them. Of course, his mind being full of other things, he never practised sufficiently. 'He never made a score at cricket.' His mind had already attained a higher level than that of his fellows, and he would have been more than human if he had not snubbed 'those who knew less,'—or, in plain English, been a bit of a prig for a while. This is probably the necessary condition for a time of every large-brained boy, whose very excellence, in its immature state, makes him awkward and disproportioned. We are hardly surprised to hear that, with all his ability and all his good qualities, he 'was not popular as a schoolboy.' He was simply in an unpresentable stage of growth; a sort of prototype of the 'Ugly Duckling' of Andersen's delightful fable, or like his own Lancelot Smith, in *Yeast*, clever and unhappy, sensitive, shy, and with a distressing stammer in his utterance.

At King's College, in like manner, he was thought 'gentle and diffident even to timidity.' In 1838 he went up to Magdalene College, Cambridge. Here he was carried off his legs at first by the vigorous physical life of the place. During his first year he read little, and 'went in for excitement of every kind, boating, hunting, driving, fencing, boxing, duck-shooting in the Fens,'—a sad waste of time and energy to him. And it would seem that during this period it was that his abiding impressions of the University were formed. Readers of *Alton Locke* will remember how it is the life of a fast set of undergraduates,—the alternation of luxurious indulgence with fierce and hot physical exertion and excitement

—which is represented as the prevailing tone and *ños* of the place. It is of course a very partial and unfair representation of the University; but it shows the idea of Cambridge which that year of fast life had left upon him, never to be effaced, and what element alone, to the exclusion of the higher constituents which go to make up University life, he had with fatal facility assimilated. A curious anecdote is preserved of him at this period, which does something to individualise the young and brilliant undergraduate:—

‘When he was about to return as Professor to Cambridge, I was very much amused one morning, on saying to the college cook, “We have a great man coming to us again, Mr. Kingsley; do you recollect anything of him?” He thought a minute, and then answered:—“Mr. Kingsley—Mr. Kingsley. Yes, I recollect him. I used to feed a dog of his, and he used to come and say” (trying to imitate Kingsley’s voice), “‘You con-founded beast, why can’t you earn your own living, and not oblige me to pay for you!’”—(p. 44).

The mention of *Alton Locke* suggests to us to remark how completely the *partial* view of the University which he gives, fits in and is consonant with the rest of the book. It is made up of *partial views*. The partial views of popular religion, the partial views of Chartism, and of political economy, —and of most things else, in short—put forth as eternal truths, amuse older men, or else disgust them, according as they are compacted more of earnestness, or of humour and *laissez-faire*. It was written in his transition, ‘Parson Lot’ epoch, and is probably, like *Yeast*, too entirely the expression of the thoughts and theories of a comparatively unimportant and not specially typical stage of life to find a permanent place in the national literature. They are brilliant sketches, for the most part dashed off at a heat, but wonderful *as* sketches, and relying, as is always the case with that class of *jeux d’esprit*, upon more or less broad caricature. But how wonderfully rich in literary promise it is! Though more deeply afflicted with what we can only call rodomontade and ‘gush’ than any other of his works, yet there is a vigour and realness in the dialogue, a precision of outline about the actors and the incidents, and a rich originality in the characters themselves, which cannot but endear it to the harshest censor. The hero himself, we are inclined to think, is idealised beyond all chance of recognition for whoever was the working-class genius who sat for the portrait. But the irascible little Crossthwaite, the huge farmer of the Fen country, the sedate and courtly dean—these are clever and life-like; and above all admirable is the righteous and rugged, stern and yet

tender Sandy Mackaye—a creation which no one who has read can ever forget, and who, if the book should live, will have had no small part, we predict, in determining the verdict of posterity in its favour.

But we are anticipating. We left Charles Kingsley in the vivacious and unwonted dissipation of his first year at Cambridge. The reaction soon came. The old thoughtful and studious habits in which he had been trained from boyhood resumed their sway over him, and after a period of gloom and despondency, in which 'he had nearly resolved to leave Cambridge and go out to the Far West and live as a wild prairie hunter,' the course of his life trended upwards; the essential piety and religiousness of his nature became once more the predominating motive within him; henceforth his life has the unity and settled direction which it had lacked before, and now a new influence comes upon him in the person of the lady whom he afterwards married, and with whom he corresponded on a vast scale for the next thirty years. He had doubts on religious subjects—many earnest young men have. We are led to suppose that she cleared them away;—from which we infer that they could not have been very deep. It was with him a period of doubt and of unrest, from whatever cause or causes it may have arisen. But this entire episode in the life is very superficially and inadequately treated, and shows one of the characteristic disadvantages above referred to, of feminine biography, which stays almost necessarily and very properly *outside* of such incidents as this.

We pass on to his ordination and settlement at Eversley. The memoir is not explicit on the exact circumstances of this his first curacy, but we gather that he was, on the whole, happily placed, and found his dearly bought experience in sports and sporting of service to him. This is what he says about it himself; and the passage may serve as a specimen of the floods of eager, simple-minded, enthusiastic *talk* which he used to pour out upon his long-suffering *chère amie*:—

' . . . There has always seemed to me something impious in the neglect of personal health, strength, and beauty, which the religious, and sometimes clergymen of this day affect. It is very often a mere form of laziness and untidiness! . . . I should be ashamed of being weak. I could not do half the little good I do here, if it were not for that strength and activity which some consider coarse and degrading. Many clergymen would half kill themselves if they did what I do. And though they might walk about as much, they would neglect exercise of the arms and chest, and become dyspeptic or consumptive. Do not be afraid of my overworking myself. If I stop I go down. I

must work . . . How merciful God has been in turning all the strength and hardihood I gained in snipe-shooting and hunting, and rowing, and jack-fishing in those magnificent fens, to His work ! While I was following my own fancies, He was preparing me for His work. I could wish I were an Apollo for His sake ! Strange idea, yet it seems so harmonious to me ! . . . Is it not an awful proof that matter is not necessarily evil, that we shall be clothed in bodies even in our perfect state ? Think of that ! . . . It seems all so harmonious to me'—(p 83).

He was only twenty-three ! and we were none of us precisely wise at that not very mature age ; but it is to be hoped that not all of us will have our letters of that age printed ! And Kingsley grew out of this yeasty period by degrees. The march of events, which was especially rapid for him, helped to ripen his character. He married ; he was presented almost immediately to the rectory of Eversley, which was his home for the rest of his life—an event which, as it seems to us, was most important in its influence over him, was, as he rightly thought it, providential, and gave freedom and spontaneity to his mental and spiritual development. It was at this time also that he came under the influence of Frederick Denison Maurice—a teacher, who influenced him more than he was ever influenced by anybody, and whom he always afterwards called his 'master' ; just as at the time people used to say it was Kingsley's mission to interpret Maurice to the masses. There certainly was something of hierophant and neophyte about the pair. The one a man of vast and nebulous conceptions, but of laboured and ineffectual utterance ; the other quick to seize and to express whatever idea was presented to him, and enthusiastic enough to pay any amount of hero-worship to his leader. In truth, their minds were closely allied to each other. Each had a natural vagueness of conception : an earnestness which anticipated a congenial idea, which leaned out of himself to meet it, and then was utterly possessed and filled up by it when it was grasped. Each was Catholic in intention, and in a sense (his own sense, be it understood) Catholic in fact.

Characteristically enough we find a letter¹ of Kingsley's illustrating another habit which formed a further point of likeness between them ; we mean the habit common to F. D. Maurice and himself, of putting *private* and somewhat strange interpretations upon words and doctrines. It was the custom of that day to abuse Tract XC. with its theory of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, as dishonest, non-natural, and so on.

¹ Vol. ii. p. 217.

But Kingsley, on the contrary, speaks apologetically of it, and held it to be tenable. 'The Tract XC. argument was quite fair,' he says, only he *did not like the way it was used*. 'I do not sign anything beyond the words, and demand the right to *put my construction on the words*' [italics ours], 'answerable only to God and my conscience.' In fact it exactly covered his own practice. He and Maurice continually acted upon it in sermons and speeches, though their views led in a different direction from the writers of the Oxford Tracts. Kingsley's view seems to have been that these, and other doctrinal standards, must be within certain limits interpreted for each generation by the living voice of the Church; whether *his* voice was its true exponent is another matter. But to speak further of Maurice would lead us too far. We must pass on to a later period of Charles Kingsley's life, just taking note of the description we find here of the spiritual state of Eversley parish when he took charge of it; a type, we fear, of too many parishes before the revival came:—

'At the beginning of his ministry there was not a grown-up man or woman among the labouring class who could read or write—for as boys and girls they had all been glad to escape early to field-work from the parish clerk's little stifling room, ten feet square, where cobbling shoes, teaching, and caning went on together. As to religious instruction, they had none.

'The Church was nearly empty before the new curate came in 1842. The farmers' sheep, when pasture was scarce, were turned into the neglected churchyard. Holy Communion was celebrated only three times a year; the communicants were few; the alms were collected in an old wooden saucer. A cracked kitchen basin inside the font held the water for Holy Baptism. At the altar, which was covered by a moth-eaten cloth, stood one old broken chair; and so averse were the parish authorities to any change, that when the new rector made a proposal for monthly communions, it was only accepted on his promising himself to supply the wine for the celebration, the churchwardens refusing to provide except for the three great festivals. This he continued to do till a few years since, when Sir William Cope undertook the office of rector's churchwarden, and at once put this matter on a right footing'—(p. 123).

Furthermore, we are told—and the fact shows both the hold which Kingsley got upon his people, and the state of crass ignorance in which they were at that time—that on the occasion of a confirmation for the parish, the whips and stablemen of the hunt stables sent him a deputation to say 'they had all been confirmed once, but if Mr. Kingsley wished it, they would all be happy to come again.'

He set on foot all kinds of improvements there, and suc-

ceeded shortly in getting the parish well in hand. But he had very much spare time—too much for so young a man—and this spare time he occupied with various plans more or less wild. He projected an *Oxford and Cambridge Review*. He thought that the English clergy must *Arnoldise*, 'if they do not wish to go either to Rome or to the workhouse before fifty years are out.' And, more than all, he was working at the *Saint's Tragedy*, of which he says, 'Dear S. Elizabeth is becoming far too developed to cut her in pieces and serve her up in a magazine; she shall appear as a poem, if I wait seven years to finish her.'

The *Saint's Tragedy* was actually published in 1848. Our limits will not permit us to enter into anything like a lengthened review of it. But we suppose the beauty and power of the poem are unquestionable; and it is equally obvious that it should be classed with *Hypatia*—a later production, but also a prose poem in its way, and at bottom occupied with the same subject. For we take it that both one and the other are simply onslaughts upon the ascetic principle. Charles Kingsley abhorred asceticism all his life, and the more the longer he lived. Influenced, doubtless, by an unusually happy married life, he seems to have made marriage the very crown and apex of human happiness, and all his life raved about it like a lover of twenty. Now the story of S. Elizabeth of Hungary derives much of its peculiar interest from the singular nature which the matrimonial relations of the Saint ultimately assumed; and hence the great interest with which Kingsley at that period of his life took it up. It was written when he was himself under the glamour of 'love's young dream;' and save that it somewhat unfairly displays the working of asceticism as not only unsexing, but almost dehumanising the character of a most noble and loving woman, it does not even suggest a solution of the problem it formulates, nor furnish any hint towards the attainment of a *ratio vivendi* between body and soul. We hold that with regard to this, the apparent purpose of the poem, the author has failed. But the earlier portion of it is full of beauty, and some of its lyrics are matchless. The little lonely princess, betrothed for her wealth, and pining in the loveless foreign court, is truthfully and tenderly touched. But the priest, Conrad, is altogether an anachronism—a Jesuit before his time; and an anachronism too in the subtlety of the analysis to which he subjects his own 'direction' of Elizabeth.

Hypatia is a maturer work, and displays a wider stage, richer colours, and an intelligible issue. It has never appeared

to us fully deserving of the blame on the score of immorality which has been sometimes cast upon it. Its characteristic—and from any seriously critical point of view, fatal—fault is that while it professedly treats of the problem of asceticism, it never puts the ascetic argument with any approach to fairness. Wherever it ventures to show its head, it is shouted down with great show of indignation, before its advocates have even opened their mouths. Added to this we see a certain sensuousness of temperament in the author which finds frequent expression in luxuriant flights of fancy in certain directions; and these, however innocent in him, are not without their danger for excitable natures. For the rest, he depicts very cleverly the strong points and the weak ones of monachism in Egypt; he makes real the dissolute Roman patriciate, into whose power as prætors or prefects the hapless provinces of the fast disintegrating Roman empire were cast as a prey, and the rude, burly, and valiant Gothic races, whom the Romans superciliously styled barbarians, and before whom the Roman empire itself was so soon to go helplessly down, as no other writer before or since has ever realised them; while his portraits of Augustine, of the good old Synesius, with the old leaven of pagan culture—which Kingsley evidently loves to show—still lingering in him, and of the unfortunate Hypatia, are, to say the least, very vivid. In the case of Cyril it is scarcely possible that he could be quite fair.

Any review of Charles Kingsley's life must take notice of the episode in it which gained him the sobriquet of 'Parson Lot'—one well known to students of the literature of that period. The origin of the name was on this wise:—

'My first meeting with him,' it is Mr. Thomas Hughes who speaks, 'was in the autumn of 1847, at the house of Mr. Maurice, who had lately been appointed Reader of Lincoln's Inn. No parochial work is attached to that post, so Mr. Maurice had undertaken the charge of a small district in the parish in which he lived, and had set a number of young men, chiefly students of the Inns of Court, who had been attracted by his teaching, to work in it. Once a week, on Monday evenings, they used to meet at his house for tea, when their own work was reported upon and talked over. Suggestions were made and plans considered; and afterwards a chapter of the Bible was read and discussed. Friends and old pupils of Mr. Maurice's, residing in the country, or in distant parts of London, were in the habit of coming occasionally to these meetings, amongst whom was Charles Kingsley.

'It was at one of these gatherings, towards the end of 1847 or early in 1848, when Kingsley found himself in a minority of one, that he

said jokingly, he felt much as Lot must have felt in the Cities of the Plain, when he seemed as one that mocked to his sons-in-law. The name Parson Lot was then and there suggested, and adopted by him, as a familiar *nom de plume*. He used it from 1848 up to 1856; at first constantly, latterly much more rarely. But the name was chiefly made famous by his writings in *Politics for the People*, the *Christian Socialist*, and the *Journal of Association*—three periodicals which covered the years from '48 to '52—by *Alton Locke* and by tracts and pamphlets'—(p. 160).

As 'Parson Lot' he used to attend and speak at Chartist meetings, contributed largely to periodicals referred to above by Mr. Thomas Hughes, and did a good deal of useful work in hunting up unsanitary abuses, getting them remedied, and such like. If it be asked, why did he take to this somewhat wild form of activity, it must be answered that Chartism was one of the popular movements of the time, and that Kingsley was always susceptible to these—as he says himself in *The Saint's Tragedy*, 'Boys must take the reigning madness in religion, as they do the measles.' And, secondly, his preferment set him free to follow his impulses in a most unusual degree. The prevailing excitement of the years from 1847 to 1850 was such as either to carry men away with its stream wholly, or to arouse in their minds a degree, almost inconceivable to us in our quieter time, of violent repulsion. Younger men can hardly realise a time when there were riots in London, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Newcastle, and other large towns; when Ireland was held down by armed force, and distress and discontent were spread over the whole country. The revolution in France increased the excitement of the labouring population to the highest degree. Then came the Chartist meeting on Kennington Common of April 10, the prospect of which caused such deep and widespread anxiety and such unusual precautions. London was filled with troops, kept, however, most carefully out of sight; the Bank of England, the Tower, and the Government offices were put into a state of defence; and a hundred and seventy thousand special constables were enrolled in London, for the purpose of supporting the regular civil force, or of acting, should it become needful, with the military.

In this element of excited feeling Kingsley revelled. It stirred his whole nature, and excited him to rapid literary production. From his pen poured, in quick succession, articles, letters, and addresses to working men, noticeable, one and all, for their simplicity and directness of tone, and for the wholesome, cordial way that he had of going straight to the

hearts of those addressed. He formed friendships at that time which lasted for life. He stored up in that capacious property-chest—his mind—a great variety of people and places, which fitted him out almost for life with scenery and actors for his novels. But we cannot find, and could hardly expect, that this Chartist period of his career bore fruit in the inauguration of any enduring means of bringing comfort and prosperity, cultivation and religion to the poor. No *dead lift* appears to be possible to an entire population, and he appears to have felt that his efforts in the direction, *e.g.* of co-operation and production by the operatives themselves, had not, on the whole, been successes. We find him writing in 1857—

‘As for any schemes of Maurice’s or mine, it is a slight matter whether they have failed or not. But this I say because I believe that the failure of a hundred schemes would not alter my conviction, that they are attempts in the right direction ; and I shall die in hope—not having received the promises, but beholding them afar off, and confessing myself a stranger and a pilgrim in a world of *laissez-faire*. . . . So I am content to have failed’—(vol. ii. p. 37).

But there was no bitterness in the confession. If one can persuade oneself that one is *un homme incompris*—a prophet appearing before his time—that is a consolation for greater failures than his had been. And then he believed thoroughly in his own principles, and that they must eventually triumph. Physical science and the organisation of labour—these he believed in intensely, and not less in his later years than in his impetuous youth. He was made a Chaplain to Her Majesty in 1859. The next year he accepted the Professorship of Modern History at his own University. He seems to have felt beforehand with a kind of foreboding the responsibility and difficulty of these new duties. It was his habit to feel things deeply ; his temperament was what we should call nervous ; as the tense chords of his nature vibrated sensitively to the touch of enjoyment, so they were prompt to forecast possible danger. But he was unfeignedly glad of the post nevertheless, and on more than one account. We find him writing to his wife: ‘All that book-writing and struggling is over, and a settled position and work is before me.’

He held this Professorship for ten years, from 1860 to 1870. It is not on the whole a division of his life’s work on which we can look with the satisfaction apparently felt by his biographer. It was not a conspicuous failure. As little was it a conspicuous success. On the one hand there cannot be the smallest doubt that he laboured with uncommon industry

and singleness of aim. The remarkable earnestness and vigour of purpose which was a feature of his mind was infectious. It *told* upon young men ; and by presenting to them the subject of their study in an amiable and attractive light, he unquestionably awakened the interest of some and won them to willing pursuit of study. So much all must willingly allow ; and it was no unimportant function to discharge. On the other hand, no one could say that he had any special acquaintance with the subject of his Professorship. It was not that he was ill-read, for he must have possessed even an unusually good acquaintance with the outlines of history, and in one or two directions had pushed his inquiries sufficiently far to enable him to speak at first hand and with authority. But his reading was in a way misleading. It tended to the theoretic and the picturesque. He could and did construct brilliant theories ; but he certainly could never grope patiently among masses of multitudinous facts. Now theories are not history ; they may even be destructive of it. To read history with a preconceived idea, is to colour the facts, and is fatal to the 'dry light' of historical fidelity ; and this was the characteristic fault of Charles Kingsley as a Professor of History ; though it is one for which the majority of the present generation is only too unlikely to be angry with him. If not the precursor of a school of historians, he was certainly one of its typical men : we mean the 'descriptive' school of history-writers, brilliant, rhetorical, philosophic, viewy. A *theory* seems to be needed in every historical work nowadays ; and the more audacious the theory, the more attractive. The practice reminds us of Luther's famous maxim — '*Pecca fortiter ; crede fortius.*' No theory is too startling to be accepted, if it be presented with sufficient literary skill ; but the theory is the spice in the cake, the *sal Atticum*, the thread upon which the pearls of fact are cunningly strung ; and must by no means be left out. It is owing to the prevalence of this theory of construction that it is found possible to have Whig or Tory historians ; that we find one popular work recently written to elucidate the theory of a 'personal' monarchy, and another to covertly recommend some five or six constitutional doctrines (or fictions), the supposed *palladia* of a great party in the State. It is, however, sufficient here to notice that the Professor did but follow the impulse of the present age, although his energy and his striking gifts made him one of its coryphæi.

Two episodes which fell during these ten years demand some notice. The first, his sermon on Weather, deprecating the

use, in a very wet season, of the prayer for Fair Weather, was preached and published in 1860, the year of his appointment; and this sermon appears to us to have been the greatest mistake he ever made in his life. It is not that we can altogether negative the strictures which he made on the mere wording of the Collect for Fair Weather, or his suggestion that a simple statement of human distress and prayer for Divine help would be sufficient for all purposes. That is perfectly possible. So also as to the question whether the excessive rain during that particular year was a blessing or a punishment. The matter was one which was fairly arguable, and might have been argued blamelessly by any one. A considerable part of the sermon is occupied with this argument. The really weighty objection to the sermon was that this particular act of prayer is objected to on grounds which apply equally to *all Prayer*. For the writer argues, first, that God is wiser than we and therefore knows better what is good for us at the time,—which is perfectly true,—and that consequently He will give it to us. Apparently Kingsley means that God will give it to us whether we pray or no; and there is a sort of impiety in this statement, seeing that the express command is, ‘in *everything* . . . let your requests be made known to God.’ And this answer is sufficient for us to give, even though we do not see the exact concatenation of the means to the end, or give the formula for the ‘parallelogram of forces’ by which the desired result is brought about, when it shall so please God; for undoubtedly prayer *has* its place and its function among the forces of the universe. But the second ground alleged by Kingsley is far worse, and is in fact the very argument of the scientific atheism of the day, viz. that the laws of nature are fixed, and amongst them those which control the falling of rain: a ground which cuts straight across *Prayer for anything whatever* in the physical sphere. The fault of the first argument is *ignoratio elenchi*. The second, as it appears to us, is altogether a misapprehension; and the practical conclusion utterly wrong. And yet we do not suppose that the writer had the slightest idea of doing anything but vindicating a too-much-forgotten truth. But it was his characteristic to hold the truth in an *unbalanced*, one-sided way, and to neglect *proportion* whether of faith or practice. It would be disrespectful, and untrue besides, to say that he could only see one thing at a time. But, nevertheless, his mind was a lens of such exceeding brilliancy and magnifying power, that an image which once got fairly depicted on its plane left little enough space to any other. He saw many truths more

clearly than others saw them—that was due simply to his strength of imaginative power; but the consequence was that the idea, or aspect of the idea, predominant for the moment, shut out all others and had the field of vision well-nigh to itself. The second episode to which we referred was the unfortunate controversy with Dr. Newman. We say *unfortunate*, since it should never have been entered into by Mr. Kingsley; and as it was a gratuitous and perfectly unprovoked attack on his part, and as far as appears, for the purpose of establishing what was a mere theory of no practical importance, so the aggression received, as was fit, a signal defeat. The matter is passed very briefly over in the memoir, and we have no desire to linger here over so strange an error in a man who in most actions of his life showed himself equally tolerant and large-hearted.

It is needful now that we should hurry quickly on to the end. His resignation of the Professorship was followed by the offer of a Canonry at Chester, whence he was speedily removed to Westminster. These were welcome preferments; but though still comparatively young, they came too late to occupy much of the life of one who had been a hard worker during many years, and had spent his vitality prematurely in the many forms of activity into which he had rushed. When he heard of the death of Dr. Macleod he said sadly (ii. 379), 'Ah, he is an instance of a man who has worn his brain away, and is gone as I am surely going.' His trips to the South of France, to the West Indies, to the Far West of North America (we are here summarising events which were separated by considerable periods of time), did but revive him just for the moment. The light was beginning to flicker low in the socket, the abundant stream of vitality to dwindle to a mere thread. The fact was, his brain never rested. His brief periods of should-have-been relaxations served him to take up new subjects. We read somewhere in the memoir that he returned from a long-anticipated excursion to Snowdon—which was to have been a time of entire rest and landing of innumerable trout—with a complete collection of the Snowdonian flora, and the plot of *Two Years Ago* worked entirely out in his head!

So at last the end came. Full of popularity though not of years, he succumbed to a neglected cold, which in earlier years he would have thrown off without effort. 'There have been many men more learned, many more able and eloquent, men also of a higher and more spiritual type; but he was a man, 'take him for all in all,' whom any generation could ill

spare before his time, and we shall not soon 'look upon his like again.'

It will be interesting to ask here, what will be a most important question to the readers of this Review, what was his exact position as a churchman and clergyman, and finally in what rank must he be put as a poet?

Now it strikes us, as to the first inquiry, that the notoriety which Charles Kingsley attained as a religious guide was owing entirely to qualities personal to himself. He was not, that is to say, the leader of a religious school, or the originator of any scheme of doctrine, or theological dogma. He could not be so for the simple reason that his mind was eminently receptive not originative. People sought him partly because his personal character commanded their confidence, partly because he enforced with much ability and energy those particular aspects of doctrine which he liked best at the moment, and which happened for the most part, and by a strange coincidence, to be those which were agreeable, or, at least, not repugnant, to the natural mind of 'society' at large as well. The fact is, there was little or no theology about him, though he was eminently religious, and 'society' liked him the better because of his untheologicalness. What he did was to teach and preach with all the resources of a striking style, with a never-failing fund of illustration, and a profound and contagious earnestness, some few striking truths. These he held and taught with intense purpose and passionate energy; or, perhaps, we are wrong in our phrase, for *the truths possessed him*, not he the truths; and so it was that his teaching hinged upon whatever truth or truths had possession of him for the time, came back to them in season and out of season, and exaggerated them out of all measure. No doubt it was the fact that he began his career with an intense repulsion from a certain type of doctrine which does not seem to have commended itself to him. It is not unusual with early manhood, for its general ferment of ideas to be shaped by reaction from some ephemeral excess either of doctrine or practice. But it became his habit of mind to fasten upon some five or six articles of the Creed, and make out of them a mutilated evangel. At the same time, the repeated perusal of this memoir has made it clear to us that he was slowly tending towards a completer faith year by year, and that his later periods showed a growing appreciation of the Catholic faith, a large part of which he had for a long time practically, though by no means consciously, ignored in his teaching. *By no means consciously*; for, as he said in a letter to the *Guardian* in 1873, concerning F. D.

Maurice, so he would have asserted of himself likewise, 'that he was always most jealous of Catholic orthodoxy, *as he conceived it*' [italics are ours]. A very appropriate *cautela*, both in the one and the other case! But he described himself as 'an old-fashioned High churchman' (ii. 283). He spoke out manfully and satisfactorily about the 'Essays and Reviews of miserable notoriety,' and which, he says, 'he had thrust away in disgust,' though there is a curious difference of tone between his letter to Dean Stanley on the subject (ii. 129) and that to the Bishop of Winchester (p. 130). He loved and highly valued the Athanasian Creed, and stood intrepidly forth to defend it in the hour of need. The speculations as to the intermediate state with which he coupled his belief in the Creed, and on which he grounded his defence of it, we are not concerned either to affirm or to deny.¹ As to his own personal practice, again, we are told that he constantly consecrated in the eastward position, until he conceived himself bound by the Purchas judgment to abandon it. His curate, Mr. W. Harrison, bears witness of him, but at a later period of his life, it must be remembered: 'I have never known any one speak more emphatically and constantly of the value of the Creeds, and the efficacy of the Sacraments, to which he alluded in almost every sermon I heard him preach.' He used the Invocation of the Blessed Trinity before preaching: 'Strangers used to inquire,' says Dr. Benson, now Bishop nominate of Truro, 'who it was who was so rapt in manner, who bowed so low at the Gloria and at the name of Jesus Christ;' and he goes on to say that

'A sub-editor of a famous religious paper once attended a chapel service at Wellington, when Mr. Kingsley preached, and then withdrew his son's name from our list, and prepared a leading article upon a supposed head-master, whose doctrine and manner were so "high"'—(vol. ii. p. 159).

Surely this man was a Catholic at heart and in life, although he might make mistakes in doctrine sometimes, and then impelled by a vehement and rather pugnacious temperament, might set himself to justify them by proving with the greatest earnestness and gravity, that a part (of doctrine) was equal to the whole, and a good deal to be preferred.

With regard to his rank as a poet, we feel less confident; and he seems to have felt something of the same doubt himself. Of his remarkable talent for versification, of his penetrating insight into feeling and character, and power of

¹ 'Our Church has no authoritative utterance on the doctrine of the intermediate state. Perhaps it were well that she should have.'

expressing what he saw and felt, there can be no doubt whatever. Probably millions of readers have thrilled over 'The Three Fishers,' or 'The Sands of Dee.' Of his constructive faculty there can hardly be much doubt either; indeed his novels sufficiently attest *that*. But he never attempted a long poem, and so we cannot tell. But what he felt with regard to himself was a certain want of discursive fancy, 'which,' he says, 'will prevent my ever being a great poet.' 'I know,' he went on, 'I can put into singing words the plain things I see and feel; but all that faculty . . . which Shakspeare had more than any man—the power of metaphor and analogue—the instructive vision of connexions between all things in heaven and earth, which poets *must* have, is very weak in me; and therefore I shall never be a great poet.'

It appears to us that he was thoroughly in the right, and has done a very rare thing—put his finger on the very point of his own deficiency. In poetic as in theologic vision (we know that we are putting forth an apparent paradox here, but we mean what we say) he wanted *breadth*. His faculty was intense but not diffusive. If he had a thing clearly before him, he could describe it with a power, tenderness, and sympathy, which leave nothing to be desired. But he could not bring it before him in all its relations. His gift was not that highest gift of exuberant *creativity*; but it was the next best, that namely of rapid and skilful realisation of whatever the circumstances of his time, or his reading, placed before his mind. If we look at his novels we shall get additional proofs of the fact. Putting on one side those, as *Alton Locke*, *Yeast*, and *Two Years Ago*, in which most of the *dramatis personæ* are copies from actual life, we find that the leading characters in the remainder are for the most part repetitions of three or four types. Some classes of character he did not assimilate, and those he could not draw; just as there were entire classes of *theological* ideas in which he did not sympathise, and which were therefore neglected in his preaching. His poetic faculty wanted strength of wing and staying power. There was something feminine about it. He could not soar far enough from details to get the large view of things. And he felt it. But his shorter poems are exquisite, and of their kind unsurpassable. This must have been in his mind when he wrote, 'I feel more and more inclined to suspect that they are what I can do best, and that I am like Camille Desmoulins, *une pauvre créature, née pour faire des vers*.' Probably it will be by some of these smaller poems,—well-nigh faultless as

they are in conception and workmanship, finished and flawless as gems—that his name will go down to distant posterity. It is by these that he vindicates his right to an honoured place in the sacred band of poets, though it be not in, or even near, the foremost rank. His writings have that power, comparatively rare, but the unerring touchstone of true poetry, and by which it is differentiated from the products of mere imitative talent—the mosaic-work, so to speak, and Birmingham jewellery of the world of poetry,—we mean the power of making the heart beat fast and the eyes fill in sympathy with some noble sentiment, or vivid picture—in purifying the mental vision as ‘with euphrasy and rue,’ so as to give a new and added impression of the worth and value of common things. This power is conspicuous in many of his works; and it is a patent of nobility to their author. Few Englishmen of our day were more widely known; few have been more missed by those who knew them; few, it must be said, have served their day and generation with more whole-hearted devotion and sincerity.

ART. IX.—THE CHURCH IN INDIA.

1. *Protestant Missions in India.* By the Rev. M. A. SHERRING. (London: Trübner and Co.)
2. *Calcutta Review* for January 1877. Art., ‘Bishop Milman.’
3. *Church Organisation in India.* Sermon by Rev. T. E. ESPIN, B.D. London: Printed for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

A CURIOUS clause in the Charter of the East India Company passed by Parliament in 1698 directed the Company ‘constantly to maintain in every garrison and superior factory one minister, and to provide there also one decent and convenient place for Divine service only,’ and further that ‘such ministers as should be sent to reside in India should apply themselves to learn the native language of the country, the better to enable them to instruct the Gentoos who should be servants of the Company or their agents in the Protestant religion.’ After the interval of nearly two centuries the responsibility of England herein openly acknowledged, for the spiritual welfare of her own sons and of the natives of the

country committed to their care, still constitutes a problem which the Church has only partially solved. It is not without humiliation that we turn to the early history of Christianity in India, and yet a retrospect of the past is absolutely necessary for a due appreciation of the present. Among the most valuable of the publications of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel are two papers by Professor Lightfoot and Dr. Maclear, comparing the progress of modern missions with their progress in early days, and there can be no doubt that the stage at present reached by the Indian Church can only be understood when thus tested by the historical method, and from observations drawn from a sufficiently wide area and extending over a sufficiently long period of time.

On a review, then, of the past, we have five distinct eras under which to arrange our outline of the growth of the Indian Church. These five eras are as follow :—

I. From the dawn of Indian missions in 1706 to the death of Schwartz in 1798.

II. From 1798 to the foundation of the See of Calcutta in 1813.

III. From 1813 to the passing of the Act constituting the sees of Madras and Bombay in 1833.

IV. From 1833 to the Mutiny of 1857.

V. From 1857 to the actual moment; one which appears likely to form as distinct an epoch in the history of the Indian Church as any of the dates above given. We propose in the present article to follow up this survey with such remarks as may serve to explain its present position and prospects.

I. The first period of all, that, namely, from the date of the first mission to India in 1706 to the death of Schwartz in 1798, can be called little more than a time for breaking ground, and it is with shame that we reflect how small a part the Anglican Church had in the movement. But for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which, in the dearth of English clergy, subsidised the earnest Danes and Germans, who devoted themselves with a self-sacrifice that has never been exceeded to the work of evangelising India, England would have been content during the whole century to have ignored all spiritual responsibility for her growing dependency. The earliest missions were planted in the South. Tranquebar was occupied in 1706 by Ziegenbalg and Plutschau; Madras, in 1826, by Schultze; Trichinopoly and Tanjore, in the latter half of the century, by the exertions of Schwartz; and Kiernander began a mission at Calcutta in 1758. The attitude of the Government was in

the main friendly. Help was even given to the missionaries to build a Church at Cuddalore in 1767. Kiernander was welcomed by Clive at Calcutta, and two of his children were subsequently given a free passage in one of the Company's ships. Schwartz, who was able to render signal services to Government, and went as their ambassador to Hyder Ali—'Let them send me the Christian,' he said of Schwartz, 'he will not deceive me'—was allowed to train the children of the Tanjore Government Schools in the Christian religion. It is estimated that 50,000 natives were baptized during the century, but they left few natural successors. Worldly motives accounted for the conversion of many; the toleration of caste was providing a root of bitterness for the future Church, while the general neglect of due provision for a native pastorate necessarily deprived the work of all elements of permanence. Tranquebar, Tanjore, and Trichinopoly, the scene of these early missions, had in 1850 less than 3,000 native Christians in connexion either with the Church or with Nonconformist bodies, and even these were not descendants of the Christians of the last century. Meanwhile the wants of the European settlers and soldiers were most inadequately supplied, and the clause in William III.'s charter quoted above remained a dead letter.

II. Passing rapidly over this dreary period we observe next that the honours paid to Schwartz, at his death in 1798, by the Government of Madras, were, by a singular tragic irony, the prelude to a second era, the main characteristic of which was the bitter hostility of the State to all work of Christian missions whatever. There is reason to believe that the conduct of the Government of India from 1798 to 1813, when the Act was passed which has been the Magna Charta of missions, earned for them a reputation and left abiding recollections that long survived the reversal of their policy. It was the age of the Evangelical revival in England, which made itself felt even in India. Two Protestant Societies, unconnected with the Church of England, determined to send missionaries to India, and at the period in question we find that interest centres in Bengal, that it declines in Madras, while Bombay during this period is connected with no religious life whatever. Early in the century the work around Madras became quite disorganised. The Danes were unable to keep up their missions, and though the Christian Knowledge Society still offered help and prevented the missions from being entirely extinguished, not a single missionary came out to represent the English Church. The Tranquebar,

Tanjore, and Trichinopoly missions became depressed and never revived. A beginning of great promise had been made in Tinnevely in connexion with the Trichinopoly mission, but for ten whole years from 1806 the district was totally neglected. Meanwhile events of pregnant importance were occurring in Bengal. The London Missionary Society sent its first missionary to that province in 1798, following up this action by opening missions in Southern India, Madras 1805, South Travancore 1806, Bellary 1810. But the event of the period was the remarkable Baptist aggression under Carey, Marshman, and Ward, which the Government tried in vain to put down. Carey had landed in 1793, settled at Malda, and studied the languages. His colleagues followed in 1799, and on being prohibited from settling in British territory, were protected by the Danish Governor of Serampore, where the Governor-General had no power to touch them. The influence of the Serampore press, the vigour and versatility with which translation after translation of the Bible was brought out in the vernaculars of India, the devotion of the missionaries to the education of the young, all these things are all matter of history. In vain Lord Wellesley ordered the deportation of missionaries, prohibited both preaching and the sale of tracts to the natives in Calcutta, and, as if to propitiate Hindoo feeling, took over the temple of Juganath into the protection and charge of the State. In 1812, by order of the Governor-General, missionaries were expelled from Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, and amongst them was Judson, the American Baptist, who was thus led to Burmah, the scene of his future conspicuous labours. But meanwhile the Serampore missionaries were influencing the country, and a feeling was growing in England which only needed the eloquence of Wilberforce to find expression in the Toleration Act of 1813.

The Church of England was beginning to awake from her lethargy in this period, and though the work of her Missionary Societies belongs to a later time, several devoted chaplains were endeavouring to combine evangelistic work among the natives with their duties to their own countrymen. David Brown at Calcutta was in every sense a missionary. Claudius Buchanan, who arrived in 1797, by his *Researches* quickened the Church at home to a sense of her responsibility. Henry Martyn's too brief career, 1805-1812, needs only to be mentioned. Daniel Corrie, afterwards Archdeacon of Calcutta and Bishop of Madras, began mission work in the North-West Provinces at Chunar, Benares, Agra, and Meerut, which

at each station led to the subsequent operations of the Church Missionary Society. But as yet there was no kind of Church organisation or Church life. A quickened earnestness among a few individual clergy and a few individual laymen is the only mark, during this eventful period, of Church growth.

III. The Act of 1813, which we have characterised above as the Magna Charta of Indian missions, marked a memorable epoch in the history of Christianity in India. It was not merely an edict of toleration, but it established the see of Calcutta, and it is only from this time the existence of a distinct visible body, which we may term the Anglican Church in India, really dates. The public opinion which led to this Act was also quickening the missionary action of the Church at home. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel extended its operations so as to include the heathen of India as well as our colonists among the objects of its care. The Church Missionary Society, now rising into importance, turned its attention at once to India. In Western India, indeed, little was done, though the Church Missionary Society began a mission at Bombay in 1820, but in Madras the failing missions began to revive under the auspices of the two Societies, and there was a considerable development in the Presidency of Bengal. In 1815 the Church Missionary Society occupied the town of Madras; the following year, at the request of the Resident at Travancore, they sent three clergy to advise and assist the ancient Syrian Church established in that State. In 1820 they began the remarkable work which has since prospered so well in Tinnevely. Since 1816 the Tinnevely Christians, some 3,000 in number, had been befriended and shepherded by an earnest chaplain, the Rev. J. Hough, whose work, *History of Christianity in India*, is still the chief authority on the subject which he treats, and it was at his instance that the Church Missionary Society came into the field. Nine years later (1829) the Propagation Society, which had already in 1825 begun work at Madras, took over the charge of the languishing missions of Tanjore, Trichinopoly, and the town of Tinnevely, which had been hitherto aided by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

In Upper India the Church Missionary Society planted a mission at Calcutta in 1816, which extended in 1817 to Burdwan, and in 1831 to Krishnagur, each within a hundred miles of the capital. We have already adverted to the beginnings of missions in the North-West Provinces, under the

influence of Corrie, between 1813 and 1820, and other stations were subsequently taken up, notably Goruckpore in 1823. The work of the Propagation Society centred in Bishop's College, founded at the instance of Bishop Middleton in 1820, amid hopes which the experience of half a century has unhappily failed to realise. The erection of the College was followed by the planting of missions south of Calcutta, that at one time gave great promise of future life.

Nor was this missionary development confined to the Church. Between 1811 and 1816 the Baptists began missions at four of the chief stations of the North-West Provinces, Delhi, Agra, Allahabad, and Benares, only to abandon the work, however, after a time, and to resume it again at a later period. In 1816, they also began work at the great city of Patna, and at Dacca, in East Bengal. Another Baptist Society took up Orissa, South Bengal, in 1822, and Burmah became the care of Judson and his colleagues, in connexion with the American Baptist Union. The London Missionary Society opened a few additional missions in each Presidency, and steadily developed their work in South Travancore. The Wesleyans opened missions in the Madras Presidency, between 1816 and 1823, but somehow these have never prospered. The American Board of Commissioners sent out missionaries, who, though driven from Bombay in 1813, obtained a footing there in 1814, and towards the close of the period under review (1813-1833) two remarkable men arrived at Bombay and Calcutta respectively in connexion with the Established Church of Scotland. Their work, however, rather belongs to the next era.

India had, therefore, now a bishop, chaplains, and missionaries; but still, from a variety of causes, there was little corporate Church life, and no real effective diocesan organisation. The unwieldy size of a diocese covering one and a half millions of square miles, the imperfect means of communication, the isolated life of a clergyman, chaplain, or missionary, the rapid mortality among the first occupants of the see of Calcutta, and the long intervals between the death of one and the arrival of his successor, who in turn was called away before he had grasped the problems which he was called upon to solve—these and like hindrances prevented the Indian Church, during this period, from being little more than a name for an aggregate of isolated units. Long before a Wilberforce had shown what an Anglican bishop may be, a bishop was sent out in conformity with an Act of Parliament to a country which knew nothing of

episcopacy, and under a Government which had but recently tried to extinguish every spark of religious zeal, and there he was bidden to form and develop a church. No wonder if in working out his position he was misunderstood, opposed, and often sorely perplexed. The chaplains, accustomed to take their orders from Government, scarcely understood, at first, in what light a bishop was to be regarded, and resisted the authority of the archdeacons who were the Bishop's commissaries at Madras and Bombay. The Directors of the East India Company were indisposed to give up their patronage, and claimed the right of their Governments to assign stations or make transfers at their sole discretion. The whole question of the discipline of the clergy so perplexed Bishop Middleton that at one time he said that he was 'labouring in chains.' Acting on the advice of the Advocate-General of Bengal, he opened formally a consistory court, but the Advocate-General of Madras gave a directly opposite opinion, and all action in the matter was suspended. In the dearth of clergy, clerical offices were undertaken, and often most irregularly performed, by laymen. In Ceylon, even the sacraments were thus administered, and there seemed no remedy. European society was in a sadly irreligious state. Owing to the many irregularities with regard to marriage the Government of India was pressed by the Bishop to introduce a Marriage Act, but refused. The want of sound professional advice in questions of ecclesiastical law was a continual anxiety to the Bishop. He writes of 'wasting himself in constant struggles to stand his ground,' and of longing to be able to return to England, that matters might be adjusted on a more satisfactory basis. Heber too, though in a less degree, felt some of the same difficulties with reference to Church discipline. Then the relation of the Bishop to the increasing body of missionaries and to the Societies was another anxious question. Bishop Middleton doubted, if under the terms of his patent he could license the missionaries at all or ordain people born in the country, though he strongly felt the need. 'According to appearances,' he writes, 'the future Christianity of India will be that of almost every denomination except that of the Church of England;' and again, 'The Church must send out missionaries, or it will not hereafter be found among the Churches of Asia.' And yet with all the drawbacks the real beginnings of an episcopal system were laid during this period. Many of the irregularities which Bishop Middleton found were remedied. Education was promoted; new schools were founded. Committees were formed in connexion with

the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge at the three Presidency towns. Missions received a distinct recognition from Bishop Heber, and henceforward became an integral part of the Church system in the country. On receiving a legal opinion that *all* the clergy in the diocese were, by the letters patent, under his authority, he licensed the missionaries and identified himself in every respect with their work; and even Bishop Middleton, though not licensing the missionaries, and feeling strongly the need of systematising mission work, has left, in Bishop's College, a signal proof of the impress of the episcopate on the missionary action of the Church.

IV. But the real beginning of diocesan organisation and of a corporate Church life in India dates from 1833, which marks the beginning of a fourth era in the history of the Indian Church. This period, closing with the Mutiny of 1857, is almost exactly synchronous with the memorable episcopate of Bishop Wilson, the history of which has never been adequately written.

'It was his dauntless hand,' as Chancellor Espin tells us, in the admirable consecration sermon preached at St. Paul's on S. Andrew's Day, 'that broke down the system of caste which was eating out the very life of the Indian native churches. It was his uncompromising championship of the Church in the face of a wealth-seeking and corrupt society, and even, when need was, against the civil government and the military power, that first won for her an honoured position in India. It was his capacity for establishing institutions which gave to Calcutta its cathedral, and to the diocese its Church Building and Additional Clergy Societies, and which first conceived and carried into effect the division of his immense territory by the creation of the sees of Madras and Bombay: a work fruitful in itself, fruitful as a precedent for Africa and Australia, about to be yet more fruitful, we hope, as a precedent for India also. His munificence furnished out the temporalities of the see, to the great benefit of his successors; his example and homely expostulations stirred up, in a community little heedful till then of any but material interests, a liberality to which the good estate of many a church structure and many a missionary school and station even now are due.'

This period was marked by a considerable development in missionary work. In Western India, as before, the Church did little, though the Church Missionary Society advanced slightly in Bombay and Sind. In Madras considerable advance was made by both Societies in Tinnevely, and by the Church Missionary Society in Travancore; while in Bengal the chief event was the Krishnagur awakening in 1838, which led to the conversion of some thousands, though the movement was not sustained. The Church Missionary

Society opened missions at Masulipatam in Madras, 1841, at Jubbulpore in the Central Provinces in 1854, and in the Punjab after its annexation. But as yet it was the time of sowing, not of reaping. Outside the Church of England, we notice that seven non-episcopal bodies, three of them being connected with America, opened missions in India; but the chief event of the period was the notable educational work of the Established, and after the disruption of 1844, the Free, Church of Scotland, in connexion with Dr. Duff, at Calcutta, and Dr. Wilson, at Bombay. It was an effort to give a Christian direction to the higher education of the country, and though it has not led to conversions on a large scale, it did lead to the conversion of some natives of the highest rank, ability, and character, conspicuous among whom is one who became a Professor at Bishop's College, the author of a learned treatise on Hindu philosophy, an Honorary Doctor of Laws of the University of Calcutta, and Bishop Milman's examining chaplain, and who still survives to be in his old age one of the brightest ornaments of the Indian Church—Krishna Mohun Banerjea.

On the whole, the period was characterised by a large advance of outposts, and at its close there was no branch of Church work which did not show distinct progress. Something had been done to quicken a religious life among Europeans; a foundation of a native church had been laid. The problem—difficult in any country, doubly difficult in a land where, owing to essential differences in constitution and race, the conquerors can never be merged in the conquered—of welding together Europeans and natives in one church was at least fairly faced, if not solved. And thus it came to pass that throughout an enormous territory, in which British dominion had gradually assumed the proportions of a gigantic empire, elements of Church life were to be found, scattered indeed, but real, when the wave of the Mutiny swept over the country, and the pastoral staff dropped from the hands of the aged prelate who for a quarter of a century had been the main guide of the destinies of the Indian Church.

V. There can be no question that, from an ecclesiastical and religious, as well as from a political and social point of view, the outbreak of 1857 constitutes the most memorable epoch in the history of our connexion with India. The Act of 1813 had paved the way for the free entrance of Christianity, but it needed the terrible convulsion of 1857 to awaken this country to a sense of her responsibility for an empire now known to contain 190,000,000 subjects, in addition to the

50,000,000 in feudatory States. It is hard for those who have only known India before 1857 to realise the change that has come over the scene. The European population has rapidly increased. The British army in India was doubled, and now numbers 66,000 soldiers. The material resources of the country have been rapidly developed; Europeans flocked in to make and work the railways and telegraph lines, and to cultivate tea, coffee, and other industries. The half-caste or Eurasian population was steadily increasing. Poverty is to be found amongst the Eurasian poor of Calcutta, as real as in the East End of London, and in as great need of the offices of the Church. Hence the due provision of the means of grace and of educational advantages for the poorer European population became the primary care of Bishop Cotton and the chief characteristic of his too short episcopate. The number of Government chaplains, though somewhat increased, in consequence of the increase of English soldiers, was manifestly inadequate for the needs of the English-speaking population, and owing to the large number of non-official immigrants the Government felt it necessary to demur to that excessive and unwholesome dependence for all religious advantages which had characterised an earlier generation, but was plainly out of place under the altered condition of things, and to admit direct responsibility only for its civil and military servants, while willing to assist voluntary effort in such further measures as might seem on public grounds to warrant an expenditure of public money. Hence a large field was at once opened for the Church's work, and this co-operation between the Church and the State, the one initiating, guiding, assuming the entire responsibility; the other assisting, subsidising and thereby eliciting voluntary effort, is a special feature of the period which dates from Bishop Wilson's death. This principle was not indeed a new one. It had found expression in the Additional Clergy Society founded in 1841, and in the famous educational despatch of 1854 sanctioning the grant-in-aid system with reference to schools, but it received, after the Mutiny, a development of application which makes us rather connect it with the fifth than with the fourth period under review. By Bishop Cotton's exertions, the number of clergy on the staff of the Calcutta Diocesan Additional Clergy Society was raised from 7 to 20, by which the ministrations of the Church were brought home to the residents of from sixty to eighty stations, which would else have been almost wholly neglected, and the bearing of such action on the progress of missions is too obvious to need exposition. 'Little is effect-

ally to be done in India,' wrote Bishop Middleton, 'for the cause of Christianity without first bringing the European inhabitants much more generally and more perceptibly under its influence.' But the main characteristic of Bishop Cotton's episcopate was the development of Anglo-Indian education in connexion with the Church. Three large schools, at Simla, Mussourie, and Darjeeling, situate respectively in the Punjab, the North-West Provinces, and Bengal—the first the Bishop's creation, the second purchased by him and converted into a diocesan institution, the third completed in his memory: we might add a fourth, a girls' school at Mussourie, though its origin is due to Archdeacon Pratt—all connected with a Diocesan Board of Education, which was to be and has been the central agency for religious education in the diocese, stand as perpetual memorials of one of the wisest bishops ever called upon to preside over any part of the Indian Church. These voluntary efforts to provide ministrations and education for the English and Eurasian population steadily progressed. In 1873 an Additional Clergy Society was started in Madras, where the Colonial and Continental Church Society had already in part occupied the ground, and a similar movement was begun in Bombay, as a branch of the Propagation of the Gospel Society. The educational movement in like manner has never ceased to grow. 'Bishop Cotton Schools,' or 'Bishop's Schools,' as they are variously called, sprang up in many parts of India. Other large schools were built in the hills, notably one at Naini Tal, in the North-West Provinces, for the lower middle classes, which has proved a remarkable success. Through the energy of several zealous chaplains, schools were founded at large stations in the plains like Allahabad and Lahore, for those who could not afford the greater expense of the Himalayan schools; and shortly before his death, feeling that the need had not yet been supplied, Bishop Milman issued an earnest appeal to the country, with the cordial co-operation of the Government of Lord Northbrook, in order to bring the blessing of a sound religious education within the reach of the poorest European.

The development of mission work since 1857 has been far more striking than in any previous period. In Bombay, still by far the most backward diocese of the three, and which, until Bishop Douglas stirred it up, made but little advance in the mission field, the Propagation Society at last (1859) began to open a mission, while the Church Missionary Society made some little progress in Sind. Even now there are less than 2,000 native Christians connected with the Church of England in

all the Bombay Presidency, and including all religious bodies except the Church of Rome, of which it is difficult to obtain accurate statistics, the total number of native Christians in the Presidency in 1871 was, according to Mr. Sherring, but slightly over 4,000,¹ although this shows an increase of 64 per cent. in 10 years. It appears that the European and Eurasian population of the Presidency in 1872, exclusive of the British army, was 15,178, of whom nearly two-thirds belonged to the Church of England. This is exclusive of a large body of Roman Catholic Indo-Portuguese. The total number of clergy in the diocese in 1875 was 59, of whom 30 were chaplains, and nearly all the rest missionaries; only 4, however, of the latter being natives of India, and these in connexion with the Church Missionary Society. The population of the Bombay Presidency was, in February 1872, 16,349,206, but including the Native States attached to the Presidency and the western part of Rajpootana, which form part of the reputed diocese, the number reaches about 30,000,000. In the diocese of Madras the progress made in the missions of both Societies, especially in Tinnevely and Travancore, has been signal and sure. The work, too, is mainly done by native agency. Thus in Travancore, where the Church Missionary Society had in 1875 17,672 baptized Christians and catechumens, there were but 7 European clergy to 15 native, and 224 native Christian lay agents and teachers. This mission has also attained a considerable measure of organisation. A native Church Council for North Travancore was started in 1869, which in 1872 developed into a provincial council for all Travancore and Cochin, consisting of all native pastors and lay delegates with European missionaries, and to be convened once a year. The annual grants made by the society in England for the support of native pastors are now paid as grants-in-aid into a Native Church Fund, and controlled by the Council. Local questions are settled by district councils, convened by the missionary in charge of the district. As a specimen of the questions referred by a local to the provincial council, we observe that in 1874 it was discussed whether a bridegroom should pay for his bride, as is usual with the heathen. The provincial council answered with a decided negative, resolving that the rule laid down by the Bishop in previous years

¹ The figures given in the official census returns of 1871-72 are quite inexplicable. Including all races the Bombay Presidency is said to contain 24,000 Protestants, besides 19,000 'native converts, the sect to which they belong not being specified,' and this exclusive of the Roman Catholics.

should hold good. In Tinnevely there is similar encouragement. In 1850 the number of native Christians in connexion with the Church Missionary and Propagation Societies was 24,613 and 10,295 respectively. In 1871 it had grown to 39,005 and 19,836, and as the total now exceeds 60,000, it is satisfactory to know that by the consecration of two veteran missionaries, Dr. Caldwell and Dr. Sargent, these missions will now have increased episcopal superintendence. The total number of native Christians and candidates for baptism in the Madras Presidency and diocese in 1875 connected with the Church of England was 97,062, of whom 63,258 (including 12,728 communicants) owe their Christianity to the agency of the Church Missionary Society, and 33,804 (including 5,998 communicants) to that of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. We observe a corresponding marked increase in the ranks of the native clergy, who on March 31, 1875, numbered 92, two-thirds of them being connected with the Church Missionary Society. On the same day there were 55 European and East Indian missionaries in the diocese, 38 chaplains and 17 additional clergy engaged in European work or education, making a total of 202 clergy. The total population of the Madras Presidency in 1872 was 30,203,009, but including the Nizam's territory, the Berars, Mysore (which, though under British administration, is a Native State), and the other Native States connected with the Presidency, and forming part of the reputed diocese of Madras, the number is not less than 50,000,000.

But the development of mission work in the diocese of Calcutta since the Mutiny—if it be not absurd to apply the term diocese to a congeries of British Provinces and Native States covering nearly a million square miles or two-thirds of all India, and containing a population of about 160,000,000—has been relatively greater than in the diocese of Madras. On the annexation of Oudh the Church Missionary Society began missions in the province (1858) and extended its work in the Punjab, opening a medical mission in Cashmere in 1863, and in 1867 making a settlement in the Punjab capital, Lahore, where the Rev. T. Valpy French founded a Divinity school, which has proved of the greatest possible service to the Native Church. The Propagation Society had just before the Mutiny founded a mission at Delhi, at the instance of the chaplain of the station. The chaplain, one of the first two missionaries, two English candidates for orders and one of the first two converts, both men of mark, whose conversion had led to the mission being formed, were massacred by the mutineers. In

1859 the mission was re-established, and the following year there were twenty-five native Christians. In 1873 the number had reached 250. By the end of 1875 it was 325, and on September 30, 1876, it was 437. The organisation of the Delhi mission, which is now giving promise of so rich an ingathering, is remarkable for its variety. There is but one European missionary at the head, who is assisted by a very able native priest, and by a native deacon in an outlying part of the district. There is a high school, eight branch boys' schools and twelve schools for boys of the poorer classes. For women and girls there are five ordinary schools, a European day school, an industrial school, a boarding school, two normal schools for training native teachers, and classes for training the Zenana missionaries, who visit the native women in their houses, weekly Bible classes for native Christian women, and a small refuge for fallen women. The mission has also a medical branch, started in 1867, which, under the charge of an experienced native doctor and European lady-superintendent, has developed most remarkably, and is now seeking to build a hospital at the cost of 1,500*l*. Patients can attend a dispensary or be visited in their own houses, and there is a class for training nurses. The city of Delhi is divided into eight districts, in each of which there is a catechist, with readers to assist him, and also a school for the better classes and a school for the poor, and some agency for teaching the women and girls. 'For the Christians in each quarter' (we quote from the report lately published in India) 'two services are held weekly, one on Sunday evening and the other on a week-day set apart for each place, while all are supposed to attend Sunday morning service and Holy Communion in S. Stephen's Church. To give some coherence and, to use the political phrase in vogue, "autonomy" to these scattered congregations, they each, where there are a sufficient number of Christians, annually elect two men who, with a third appointed by the mission, form a local "panchayat," and the combined representatives of the districts form the central "panchayat" or Church council. These people are useful in advising the local catechists, in making arrangements for the services, in settling petty disputes, and, above all, in influencing for good the non-Christian people of their own quarter.' There are eight branch missions, with similar though fewer agencies, in a district containing a population of about 3,000,000 souls. Into this multiform machinery Mr. Winter and his colleague, Tara Chand, infuse a life and power which are now producing their effect, and it is satisfactory to learn that the

University of Cambridge is undertaking a 'Cambridge mission' to strengthen Mr. Winter's hands. Of course it is not every mission that has the same efficient organisation, but still this sketch may be taken as a sample of the various agencies which are included under the term Mission. Though still of recent origin and numbering together little more than 1,200 native Christians, and planted in confessedly the most difficult mission field of India, among a race of men whose sturdy independence of character contrasts with the instability of the more timid Bengali, the Punjab missions of the two Church Societies, those of the Church Missionary Society north, and of the Propagation Society south of the Sutlej, have already exercised a perceptible influence over the country, and are steadily gaining ground. In 1876 the Church Missionary Society employed in the Punjab thirteen European and seven native clergy. The total number of clergy in the province, which contains a population of about twenty millions, was, including those absent in England, about sixty, nearly equally divided between chaplains or clergy ministering to English congregations and missionaries, with a few ordained school-masters. In the North-Western Provinces, with Oudh, where the Propagation Society is represented only by small missions at Cawnpore, Banda, and Roorkee, which have yet to make their mark, the Church Missionary Society has made fair progress at Agra, Allahabad, Benares, and especially Goruckpore. In a province with a population numbering forty-two millions, the Church can claim scarcely 4,000 native Christians, or less than one in every 10,000 souls, but in view of the agencies used, the duration of the missions, and the character of the people, the advance, though slight, gives no ground for discouragement. The missions of the two Societies in Lower Bengal cannot be said to have made satisfactory progress. The Krishnagur mission of the Church Missionary Society has remained almost stationary, though improved during the last few years, and with 5,000 Christians has barely more than 300 communicants. Nor can cheering progress be reported of the Propagation Society's missions south of Calcutta.

On the other hand, a most remarkable work has been meanwhile developed amongst the aboriginal tribes living in the hills and on the tableland that connect Bengal with Central India. By the agency of the Church Missionary Society about 1,500 Santals have embraced Christianity, and a singular testimony to the mission was recently borne by some Bengali land-holders in conversation with Sir William Muir. 'The Santals,' they said, 'were degenerating as a race

by contact with the people of the plains, and they were given to drink; but the *Christians were an exception*; they never drink.' More remarkable still, however, is the work of the Propagation Society among the Kols of Chota Nagpore, where, in 1869, it inherited part of the labours of Pastor Gossner's mission started in 1846. Five thousand Christians, in 1869, have increased to 10,000 in 1877, and the catechumens are not less than 1,000 each year. Of the fourteen clergy connected with the mission ten are natives of India and nine of these natives of Chota Nagpore. Of the remainder three are Germans, and only one an Englishman, his colleague having been recently taken to his rest after a career of signal devotion. The mission is admirably organised, and the harvest is ripe, but the labourers are painfully few, and there is probably no mission field in India where there is a more urgent need of additional reapers. The Propagation Society has also, since the Mutiny, begun mission work amongst the Buddhists of Burmah. The missions are as yet in their infancy, and had on January 1, 1876, but 451 native Christians connected with them, of whom two-thirds were Tamil Christians from Madras resident in the province; but there is promise for the future, and a Bishop of Rangoon with an increased staff would probably soon be the means of working a considerable change. An interesting mission of the same Society in Assam was designed by Bishop Cotton to be one of a chain connecting East Bengal and Assam with Burmah, but it remains a solitary link. Still, as always, the part of the diocese, and we may say of India, most spiritually destitute is that large central tract which divides Bengal and the North-West Provinces from the Presidency of Bombay. Rajpootana with its nine millions of souls has no Church mission whatever. The States comprising the 'Central India Agency,' including Gwalior and Indore, and with a population of 8,360,571, had no mission whatever until recently two of the Cowley Fathers settled at Indore. The Central Provinces, a part of British India, with a population of 8,201,519, would be equally destitute but for the mission of the Church Missionary Society at Jubbulpore, with its 127 Christians, and for the small beginnings in the neighbourhood of Nagpore called 'the Chanda and Central India Mission,' which are due entirely to the zeal of the chaplain of Nagpore. It is much to be hoped that the Scottish Episcopal Church, which at present gives a grant to this good work, will see her way to more vigorous action and make this field her own. In the Nizam's territory, and the Berars, with a population of over 11,000,000

souls, the Church Societies have two small missions, but taking the whole of this vast tract in the interior of India, covering 402,205 square miles (more than a fourth of all India) and containing a population of 37,000,000, we find that there were in 1871 but 2,509 native Christians, exclusive of Roman Catholics, and but a small proportion of these owed any allegiance to our own Church. The total number of native Christians in the diocese of Calcutta at the present time in connexion with the Church of England appears to be about 28,000, or, including catechumens, 30,000; of whom, owing to the Chota Nagpore mission, rather the larger proportion are connected with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The number is but a third of that in the Madras Presidency, but in view of the recent origin of so many of the missions, and of the different conditions of native life and character in Upper and Lower India, and of the fact that in 1863 the number is stated by Bishop Cotton to have been but 12,537, it must be admitted that there has been a real and considerable growth. It is difficult to obtain an estimate of the total number of native Christians in connexion with the Church of England in India at the time of the Mutiny, but in 1863 it was estimated by Bishop Cotton as 73,816. In 1876 it was, we believe, about 108,000, or, including candidates for baptism, not far short of 130,000. In 1863 there were forty-nine native clergy in all India and Ceylon. In 1876 there were forty-one in the diocese of Calcutta (twenty-one of whom were connected with the Propagation Society), ninety-two in Madras, four in Bombay, a total of 137 in India exclusive of Ceylon. In 1814 the whole number of clergy in India was less than forty. In 1834 it was about 120. In 1876 the number on the list of the diocese of Calcutta alone was 237 (an increase of 103 since 1859), of whom ninety were chaplains, thirty-seven additional clergy and ordained schoolmasters, sixty-nine European missionaries, and forty-one natives. The number of clergy in the three Indian dioceses was at the same time about 500, of whom, to speak in round numbers, 300 were engaged in missionary work.

The real significance of these statistics is only seen when we bear in mind the great variety of elements which constitute Church life in India, and their unequal distribution through the country. It has lately been observed with reference to precautions against famines, that the vast area of India includes the climate and meteorologies of many different regions, each of which requires separate study and

consideration, that India is more a continent than a country, and what is true of one province may be quite untrue of another. The observation is even more powerfully true as regards everything with which the Church has to do. It is only here and there over an immense extent of territory, and in most unequal proportion, that the Church is represented at all, and to apply to all India observations drawn from a limited number of districts, or to assume, without local knowledge, that the best observations which can be drawn from the whole of the Church's work in the country will apply with any truth whatever to any particular part, would be as unreasonable as to argue upon the condition of Europe from observations drawn from England and Russia alone. A recognition of this truth is the first requisite for a due appreciation of the condition of the Indian Church. To one the Church in India may be chiefly connected with the religious life of those who have left our shores to take part in the government of the country; to another, the care of 66,000 British soldiers may be the leading idea; to another, the care of the tea or indigo planters, the railway employes, and the increasing number of Englishmen who take part in commercial or industrial enterprise; to another, the heavy responsibility of making adequate spiritual provision for the large population of Eurasians or inhabitants of mixed race, of whose number, from reasons which it is not difficult to understand, no accurate estimate has yet been published. To most Churchmen we apprehend that the Church in India conveys rather the idea of a native indigenous church, but do they always realise what various elements are included under this term? In race and language, in national character, in religion, what we call 'India' presents not one people, but it embraces a congeries of peoples. Dr. Caldwell informs us that one hundred different languages of three distinct families are spoken between the Himalayas and Cape Comorin, of which twenty are cultivated, and possess some literature of their own, and even this is exclusive of the totally different languages of Burmah. In the diocese of Calcutta, Church missions are being conducted in at least twelve languages, of which Hindi (the great language of Central India), Urdu, and Bengali, are the chief. In Madras, the Dravidian languages, such as Tamil, Telugu, and Malayalam, are the most prominent, on the west Canarese, Mahratti, and Guzerati. Between the easy and indolent Burman, the Bengali with his facility for acquiring Western learning, but want of pluck and stamina, the superstitious

aboriginal of Central India, the manly if illiterate Punjabi, the simple Tinnevely villager, the differences are sufficiently wide to make the foundation of a Church which shall embrace them all a more complex problem than we are sometimes apt to think. And this complexity becomes a far more serious question, when it is remembered that in our Indian Empire we are brought face to face with the three greatest religions of the non-Christian world—Hinduism, Mahomedanism, and Buddhism, each presented to us in many shapes, and each the settled and definite religion of millions for centuries, with its religious books, its priesthood, and its creed permeating the very life and law and social institutions of its adherents. The unequal distribution of these various elements, whether of condition and circumstance or of Church life, is another point to be most carefully observed. The Buddhists of our Indian Empire are almost entirely confined to Burmah and Ceylon. Of the 190,000,000 of British India, 140,000,000 are Hindus, scattered through the country, but less preponderating in the north. Of the 40,000,000 of Mahomedans, exclusive of feudatory States, 20,000,000 are in Eastern Bengal alone; 10,000,000 in the Punjab, where they constitute 53 per cent of the population, and 10,000,000 scattered through the rest of British India—a fact which is not without its significance in its bearing upon recent discussions. Turning to the various elements of Church life, we observe what an imperfect and misleading impression we should receive on simply hearing that there are so many Europeans and so many native Christians in India, or that the diocese of Calcutta contains nearly 100,000 Europeans and East Indians, and 30,000 natives connected with the Church. In the Punjab, the Church is represented, as we have seen, by some sixty clergy, including nine natives; 20,000 Europeans, chiefly soldiers, and 1,200 native Christians. In Tinnevely, on the other hand, the Church means a mere handful of Europeans, and more than 60,000 native Christians, with a large staff of native clergy; and yet the 1,200 in the Punjab are more significant in their relation to Indian Christianity than a corresponding number in Tinnevely. Numbers alone are no sufficient test of Church progress. Grand as the work has been amongst the aboriginals of India, the effect on the country would be inconceivably greater had 10,000 Brahmins instead of 10,000 Kols become converts to the faith. In Assam, on our North-Eastern frontier, the Church means about 1,000 Europeans, mainly tea-planters, and some 600 or 700 natives, 250 of whom are natives of the province

connected with the Propagation Society's Tezapore Mission, and the rest Christian Kols from Chota Nagpore, who have migrated as labourers on the tea gardens, in upper Assam, or Cachar. The Church in Burmah means a dozen clergy, half of them missionaries, but none natives, about 5,000 Europeans and Eurasians, half of them being soldiers, 300 Tamil Christians, and 150 converts from Buddhism. In that large tract of Central India of which we have spoken, covering more than a fourth of the whole country, the Church is represented by a few English garrisons, under the care of chaplains, a sparse population of European officials—very few Europeans who are not officials, and a few hundred native Christians with four or five missionaries. The province of Bengal, with its sixty millions of souls, seems to combine all the various elements within itself. Soldiers, sailors, civilians, planters, merchants, railway servants; Europeans, Eurasians, natives of many races and languages, Bengalis, Hindustanis (in Behar), aboriginals in Santalia and Chota Nagpore; adherents of Hinduism, Mahomedanism, even Buddhism on the Himalayas, and of the shapeless superstitions which make the aboriginals at once the most degraded and the most receptive of Christianity among the races of India; people speaking at least seven distinct languages, and embracing more than three-fourths of all the native Christians who own allegiance to the Bishop of Calcutta: all these are surely enough to show the variety of interests which the Church in India represents, and the complexity of the problem which she is called upon to solve. It may be right for those who are connected with any single branch of such complex work, whether amongst Europeans or amongst natives of the country, to be so absorbed in it as almost to forget its relation to the whole, but the Church as a corporate body cannot be identified with any one of its component parts. An Indian bishop, *à fortiori* an Indian Metropolitan, is bound to survey, to develop, to show sympathy with all the various efforts in which Christianity finds expression, to mould into one organic system, to weld into one homogeneous whole—without regard to race distinctions, and without seeking to Europeanise the country of his adoption—all those various and sometimes almost discordant elements of Church life which are scattered throughout his vast charge.

That in every branch of this many-sided work there has been a real advance since the Mutiny there is abundant testimony. The increased spiritual care of the large military force stationed in the country—'greater, I suppose,' Bishop Cotton wrote in

1863, 'than in any diocese in Christendom unless it be that of Paris in these Imperial days'—has kept pace with the increased provision made by Government for the material and intellectual well-being of the British soldier in India. In addition to the regular visits to schools and hospitals, soldiers' institutes and prayer-rooms, Bible classes, greater care in preparation of candidates for confirmation, a vigorous development of the 'Guild of the Holy Standard,' which, started in England under the auspices of the late Chaplain General, has taken root perhaps more deeply in India, and being worked in no party interest by Churchmen of many minds, has proved a real help in promoting religion in the army—these and other indications of a deeper sense of responsibility for our soldiers meet us on every side. Nor is less attention paid to other Europeans and Eurasians. An Indian chaplain works his station or district much as an English clergyman his parish. Schools for the poorer classes have sprung up, chiefly through the zeal of the clergy. Such good work as is to be found, for instance, among the employés of the East Indian Railway, at Jamalpore, in Bengal, will compare with that of any English parish. Celebrations of the Holy Communion are frequent, and more careful pastoral visiting is another sign of quickened life. Many of the chaplains too, to include under that term all who are working among Europeans, help forward vigorously the mission work of the Church. We have already alluded to the organisation which owes its origin to the chaplain of Nagpore. It may be added that the work now being done by a native deacon, in connexion with the Propagation Society at Dinapore, is entirely due to the efforts of the late chaplain of that station, and many other instances might be mentioned. Whatever reproach may have attached, justly or unjustly, to Indian chaplains in time past, it may safely be said, that at the present time, notwithstanding the peculiar difficulties of an isolated life in an enervating climate, they will compare favourably with a similar body of parochial clergy at home.

There is, as may be expected, no less testimony to the quickened spiritual life amongst the English-speaking laity in India. It is, we fear, still true that the moral evils of the British army and other European settlers are among the great stumbling-blocks to the spread of Christianity, and that, as Bishop Cotton wrote in 1863, 'the neglect of Christ's Holy Communion is one of the greatest evils in the army;' but there is a sensible diminution, both in the moral evil and

in the spiritual neglect, and an amount of lay help has been evoked, which in the ante-Mutiny period was comparatively rare. In the diocese of Calcutta, Church committees have been formed, answering in great measure to 'lay trustees' in the diocese of Madras, to assist the clergy in their work. The system has in most cases answered well. The revival of the offices of 'sub-deacon' and 'reader' by Bishop Milman has also in many cases provided an admirable channel for lay zeal; and civilians, officers, railway officials, and merchants are now to be found under episcopal authority, and within duly defined limits, holding services, visiting the sick, and gathering in the poor. In connexion with the Cathedral of Calcutta, a zealous sub-deacon aided by like-minded friends, and under the general supervision of the Cathedral chaplains, has been devoting the spare hours of a busy mercantile life to bringing home the ministrations of the Church to some of the lowest and most ignorant Eurasians of the city. The voluntary offerings of the laity in India are another indication of Church life which should not be overlooked. From the financial returns compiled by the Bishop of Madras for 1874, it appears that English congregations in that diocese contributed, during the year, about 11,750*l.*, being about 650*l.* more than in 1873. Of this about 7,000*l.* was given for Church expenses and education, 1,070*l.* for spiritual agencies amongst Europeans and Eurasians, and 1,160*l.* in aid of the Missionary Societies of the Church. We observe from the Calcutta Diocesan Report of the Propagation Society for 1875, that the drafts on the parent Society during the year covered little more than half the total cost of the Society's missions in the diocese. 9,000*l.* had to be raised from other sources, and if we deduct 4,200*l.* realised by school fees and Government grants in aid, there will still remain nearly 5,000*l.*, which was mainly due to the liberality of the laity of the diocese. Some may have little idea of the cost of maintaining such organisations as those of Chota Nagpore or Delhi; which, notwithstanding large grants from the Society, have each to raise privately at least 1,200*l.* a year. The missions of the Church Missionary Society in the Calcutta diocese received in 1874, from offertories, subscriptions, and donations, about 6,500*l.*, in addition to the grants from the parent Society, and to school fees, grants in aid, &c. A portion of this is remitted by friends of special missions at home, but the bulk of it is contributed by the laity of the diocese, and in no small degree owing to the exertions of the chaplains. We observe also that the Calcutta

Diocesan Additional Clergy Society raised, in 1874-75, about 2,750*l.* in India, exclusive of dividends, &c.; the Diocesan Church Building Fund nearly 1,000*l.* We might mention many more funds and societies which have been liberally supported, and it is worth noticing that 5,000*l.* has been raised in India for the foundation of a Lahore bishopric in memory of Bishop Milman. The idea is still current amongst us that Indian laymen have ample means, and that all the mission work done in the country is done with money sent out from England. It is time that both fallacies should be exploded. The former was emphatically contradicted by Lord Northbrook, in an important speech made for the Lahore Bishopric Fund, at Oxford, in November last. The latter is disproved by the statistics which we have given, and while there is unquestionably room for a much greater advance, there is scarcely a mission in the country which will not gladly bear witness to the value of its local support, and some names there are, such as Sir William Muir, General Reynell Taylor, Commissioner of Amritsar, Colonel Dalton, late Commissioner of Chota Nagpore, which are associated with a thoughtful consideration and a princely generosity that deserve the commemoration of a grateful Church.

We have already devoted so much space to the development of Church missions since 1857, that it is only necessary to observe here that the same advance in tone and quickening of Church life is apparent in this as in every other work. The remark made by Bishop Wilson in his missionary charge, delivered at Tanjore in 1835, 'Perhaps not one in twenty of those who come out from Europe in all the Protestant Societies with the best promise, and who go on well for a time, persevere in the disinterestedness of the true missionary,' could not be repeated in 1877. The biographer of Bishop Cotton only does justice to the missionary body in dwelling on the widened views which have characterised them in the post-Mutiny period. It is no longer thought sufficient to preach a set of doctrines in a Western dress to Orientals of many races and tongues, but there has been an intelligent and patient effort to enter into Oriental thought. Few more remarkable State papers have ever been published than the Blue-book *Indian Progress and Condition*, printed in 1873, in which the labours of the missionary body have received a full recognition, and although the official point of view is somewhat different from our own, the tribute is fully deserved. We have already dwelt on the developed organisation of such missions as those of Travancore, Chota Nag-

pore, and Delhi. The spiritual growth has been equally marked. There has been a sensible rise in tone, heartier Church services, more reverent worship, more frequent and more frequented celebrations of the Holy Communion, increased indications of a corporate Church life. The native Church is being formed on a more independent basis than formerly. Of the 314 adults of the Delhi mission, 59 are employed as catechists, school teachers, and zenana visitors; the remaining 255, though by no means harder worked than those in our own employment, earn their own living as independently as Englishmen in similar lines of life; they live in their old homes in the streets and courts of Delhi and the villages, and are thus in a position to influence the general mass of the people around them. We observe that in the Church Missionary Society's missions of the Madras diocese, 1,500*l.* more was contributed by the native Church in 1874 than in 1871, which shows an increased proportion of the total expenditure. The native clergy of the Chota Nagpore mission derive no part of their salary from the Propagation Society. All these are healthy signs of progress.

That much of this quickened life, of whatever kind, is due to the personal influence of the Indian Bishops is abundantly clear, and the fact shows the serious importance of fit appointments being made to our Indian sees. Whether or not it be true that in England the movement has begun from below and reached those above, there can be no question that in India it has begun from above, and that the Bishop, the *persona ecclesiae*, has communicated it to the clergy and laity of his diocese. An episcopal visitation in India means something very different from the same thing at home. It is only at the Presidency towns that any number of clergy can be gathered together to listen to a charge. The real work of the visitation is the actual progress itself of the overseeing Bishop through all the different stations European or missionary of the diocese, the careful supervision of every branch of Church work, the cultivation of sympathy between European and native, the initiation or support of schemes or institutions for bringing the Church to bear upon the people, the giving a fresh impetus to Church life in every form. Then further we have to remark that, owing to the isolation of the clergy and distance of the stations the Bishop becomes the chief means of communication between them all on matters of common concern, and between them as a body and the Church at home. Perhaps this characteristic of the Indian episcopate never found nobler expression than in the great

man whom the Church at home and abroad has not yet ceased to mourn, the late Bishop of Calcutta. The special need of his time, as Chancellor Espin rightly gauged, was to infuse into the machinery that already existed 'a fresh and quickened life, to rouse to energy and progress, to inspire with the spirit of zeal and love and self-sacrifice. And all testimony declares that Dr. Milman did this special work rarely and nobly. He left religion wherever he passed deeper, more real, more spiritual by far than he found it. This was a work to be done almost man by man, and Bishop Milman poured into it his very life.'

In considering the development of the Indian Church since 1857 there are two points which cannot be ignored. The first is that this quickened life is not confined to the Church of England, but that there has been a growth of other religious bodies, which must have important consequences hereafter in influencing the country. It is very difficult to obtain accurate statistics of the Roman Catholic missions. They are still far the most numerous Christian body in the country, but this seems principally to arise from the presence of the large Indo-Portuguese population and from missions in former days. It would seem doubtful whether their present rate of progress is equal to that of other bodies and whether their chief work now is not rather pastoral and educational than evangelistic. But the able and interesting *History of Protestant Missions in India*, by the Rev. M. A. Sherring, though not written from a Churchman's point of view, enables us to judge of the progress of all these various bodies which are ranged under the term Protestant, and we shall do well to observe the results. America has not less than seven Non-conformist Societies at work, and it would seem as if almost the only American body unrepresented were the Episcopal Church. One so-called 'episcopal' body, the 'Episcopal Methodists,' has since 1857 started a network of missions in Oudh and part of the North-West Provinces, and claimed 1,835 converts in 1871. The American Presbyterian chain of missions from the Punjab to Allahabad had more than 1,300 native Christians in 1871. The American Lutheran Society and the American Evangelical Society are both of recent origin. The latter has opened missions in the Central Provinces, while the former has had considerable success further south. The American Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, which took up the Arcot mission in 1850, claimed 2,271 converts in 1871, while the number of native Christians in Madura connected with the American Board of Commissioners was, in:

1871, 7,341, having nearly doubled in twenty years. Most remarkable of all is the work of the American Baptists; who, besides important missions in Assam and Orissa, have been the means of converting upwards of 50,000 Burmans—mainly belonging to the aboriginal tribe of Karens—a work which painfully contrasts with our own small beginnings in the same country. It strikes us that the time may come when these facts may have a political as well as a religious importance. Turning to European non-episcopal bodies, we observe that the Leipsic Lutherans increased from 5,000 in 1861 to 9,000 in 1871, that the Canarese missions of the Basle Evangelical Society claimed 4,612 Christians in 1871, being an increase of 1,615 in ten years; that the Irish Presbyterian Society had in 1871 made a fair start in Gujerat, in the Presidency of Bombay, that while 10,000 Christian Kols of Chota Nagpore are connected with our own Church, a still larger number are connected with the German Lutherans; that while the Church Missionary Society's missions in Travancore claimed, in 1871, 14,306 Christians, those of the London Missionary Society in the same province claimed in that year not less than 32,122. Nor can we forget that the most important Christian influence yet brought to bear upon the higher education of the natives has been due, not to Churchmen, but to Dr. Duff and Dr. Wilson of the Free Church of Scotland. We are too apt to parcel out a country into dioceses and to ignore work that is not our own, but such facts as those cited above must surely make it a matter of serious reflection to every Churchman what form Indian Christianity shall in the future assume, and whether, with all our increased efforts and our boasted wealth, we have yet awakened as a Church to a sense of our spiritual responsibility for the millions of Indians who acknowledge our sway.

This consideration becomes the more urgent when we reflect that the quickening of Church life has been accompanied, not simply by a similar development on the part of other religious bodies, but by a remarkable intellectual awakening of the native mind. English civilisation and English education are rapidly undermining ancestral beliefs. Even caste, the most impregnable of strongholds, yields to the necessities of the railroads. But if the ancient faiths are being unsettled, what is to take their place? The Brahmo Somaj, now connected in the minds of most of us with the name of Keshub Chunder Sen, does but represent an effort to feel the way to a purer faith, and it is melancholy to find that it is not fulfilling its early promise of paving the way for Chris-

tianity. The religious future of India will be blank atheism unless Christianity steps in. English sceptical writings are eagerly reproduced. We find from Bishop Wilson's *Life* that Paine's *Age of Reason* was circulated in India for the benefit of the natives. It cannot be too seriously remembered that only a determined effort on the part of the Church in the time that is now to come can enable her to give a Christian direction to this intellectual movement and to win for the Church's Master minds that must else be given over to the blankness of despair.

VI. Five periods of the Indian Church have passed away, and now we seem to see indications that from 1877 will date a sixth. We have traced its history from those early beginnings in the last century when all that England did for India was to give small subsidies to Danes and Germans for work that was plainly England's own; through that period of persecution when the great Baptist missionaries put the Church to shame, and when but for the zeal of a few earnest chaplains the Church would have been almost unrepresented; through the period of early episcopal organisation, of beginnings of Church missions, of imperfect strivings after something higher and nobler; through the vigorous episcopate of Bishop Wilson, when the isolated efforts of earnest men began to find expression in diocesan institutions, and Europeans and natives to be conscious that the Church was a power in the land; and through the far more eventful period which, dating from the Mutiny, has been characterised by an awakening and growth that have won the recognition of statesmen. And now, as Mr. Espin has told us, we have come to a new point of departure, and must face the problem of Church organisation. Into the details of such a task it is scarcely our province to enter here, but we may just indicate certain points which have gradually assumed prominence and will assuredly receive attention. The growth of the European and Eurasian population is such as to necessitate more adequate spiritual provision, and greater facilities for religious education on the lines so wisely laid down by Bishop Cotton. Turning to the mission field we observe three questions in which the experience of the past has given lessons for the future. The mistake of scattering missions over a large area is not likely to be repeated. With a wisdom which our own societies only tardily learnt, the American Baptists made Burmah their own field; the American Episcopal Methodists, a limited area in Oudh and Rohilcund; the United Presbyterians, Rajpootana.

The network of missions which the Church Missionary Society has been able to spread over Travancore, the Propagation Society over Chota Nagpore, and both Societies over Tinnevely, is in each case an example of similar organisation, but other missions of the two Societies have from their isolation far less effect on the country than if they were part of a visible system over a limited tract. The system of teaching religion in mission schools is another point deserving close consideration. Without adopting the somewhat too strong statements in the pamphlet of General Tremenhare, noticed in a previous issue, and fully believing in the value of mission schools as a missionary agency, we cannot shut our eyes to the existence of abuses which we trust and believe will be remedied. The extracts from Bishop Milman's journals published in the January number of the *Calcutta Review* alone show how one eminently qualified to judge lamented the want of a definite, intelligible, wise system of teaching Christianity to heathen children. And perhaps the most pressing question of all connected with missions is that of native agency and training natives for the ministry. That which should be the first care has been too often postponed to less important things. The American Baptists acted far differently in Burmah where at an early period of their work they founded a theological seminary, which is still one of the best managed colleges in our Eastern dominions. Bishop's College, Calcutta, has never realised the hope of its founder, for reasons into which it is unnecessary to enter, and it is now agreed that for training candidates for the native ministry each district or group of missions should have its own seminary, and that this work should be undertaken by the ablest missionaries. The annual letter for 1872 of the Rev. T. V. French, the founder and first principal of the S. John's Divinity School, Lahore, is so extremely valuable that we give an extract as embodying the matured opinion of one of the most thoughtful and learned of Indian missionaries :—

'The very *last* thing which has been practised amongst us as missionaries was what the greatest stress was laid and effort expended upon by Hindoo sect-leaders and by the early British and Anglo-Saxon missionaries, as well as by Mahomedan moollahs everywhere : I mean giving a few instruments the finest polish possible ; imbuing a few select disciples with all that we ourselves have been taught of truth, and trying to train and build them up to the highest reach of knowledge attainable to us. It is but seldom that this has been the relation of the missionary to the catechist ; of the schoolmaster to the student ; what the Soofie calls " iktibās," lighting the scholar's lamp at the master's light. The perpetuation of truth (must we not add of

error also ?) has in every age depended on this efficacious method of handing down teaching undiluted and un mutilated. To this we have become scarcely awake as yet : the learned missionary or the deep spiritually taught missionary is rather in his study and his books than reproducing his doctrine, spirit, character in the minds and hearts of some chosen "chelas" or followers. It was such a method of working to which our Lord has encouraged and led us, not by his own example alone, but by these memorable words : "The disciple is not above his master : but every one that is perfect shall be *as* his master."

But of all questions the increase of the Indian episcopate is the one which now most presses for solution. It is absolutely necessary for the development of that synodical action for which the Church is now ripe and which she anxiously desires. It would be almost an insult to the intelligence of any one who believes in episcopacy at all to attempt to press the inadequacy of one bishop for the complex work, conducted in twelve languages, of a diocese which contains more than 150,000,000 souls, scattered over an area of nearly 1,000,000 square miles. It is, therefore, with sincere gratification that we learn that the scheme so earnestly desired by Bishops Cotton and Milman, of founding new bishoprics in the Punjab and Burmah, is on the point of being carried out. And as these proposed new sees will relieve the diocese of Calcutta on the north and east, we yet hope to see a bishopric founded in the very heart of India, perhaps at Nagpore, which may relieve the Metropolitan on the extreme west, and be a centre of new life in the most destitute part of the country: The example set by the dioceses of Winchester and Oxford, at the instance of a generous layman, in charging an English diocese with special responsibility for founding an Indian see, is an important precedent for future action. But the right and duty of initiative in the whole question plainly belongs to the Indian Church. The development, to be sound, must be natural and must proceed from within. The many-sidedness of Church work in India, and the unequal distribution of the elements of Church life through the country—we may add, the sudden rise into prominence of fresh centres, like Chota Nagpore—show the impossibility of appreciating all the conditions of the problem to be solved without local experience, and the necessity of the Church of England recognising at least the 'administrative autonomy' of her daughter Church in the East.

This completion of diocesan organisation must in time necessitate the careful consideration and adjustment of two important questions, which are at present compromised rather

than solved—the attitude of a growing Church to the Missionary Societies at home and to the State. With reference to the former of these, we cannot do better than recommend to careful attention the weighty words of Chancellor Espin :—

‘ Earnest men a few generations ago had to act like soldiers who find themselves in front of the foe with no immediate orders and no officers at hand. They band themselves together, and bravely do their best in their own way. But as the whole host resumes its embattled movement, these several combinations will naturally find their own place in the ranks. And as it is the approach to diocesan organisation which has brought up these troubles, so it will be the perfecting of that organisation that will take them away. . . . There is no reason in principle at all why all societies of Churchmen should not retain their integrity and modes of working, and yet find their regular and recognised place as Church societies ; and when they have found it, the problem is solved.’

The second question has been seriously raised by the extreme difficulty which has until lately been experienced in providing for the absolutely necessary increase of the Indian episcopate, but it is a question to be calmly and thoughtfully considered from many points of view, and upon which misconception has already arisen that has impeded practical action.

It is well known that the Indian bishops derive their salaries from the State, in accordance with Act of Parliament, and that a moderate sum of money is provided annually in the Indian Budget for the payment of chaplains and for other expenses incident to an official connexion with the country. In the early days of the episcopate there was a disposition on the part of the State to treat the Church as simply a department of State, and not to recognise the independent spiritual authority of the Bishop ; but it is impossible to study the history of the Indian Church—comparing, for instance, the life of Bishop Middleton with that of Bishop Cotton—without observing the gradual withdrawal of the Government from an Erastian position, and its desire to recognise the Church's distinct and separate functions. When once a chaplain arrives in India he acts entirely under the orders of the Bishop, and though appointments are technically made and gazetted by the Government, in every case it is on the motion of the Bishop. In default of ecclesiastical courts, discipline can only be exercised by a concurrence between the Bishop and the Government, just as in the case of missionaries there must be a concurrence between the Bishop and the Societies ; but practically there appears to be as little diffi-

culty and as substantial justice in one case as in the other. Occasionally we find, though decreasingly of late years, a tendency to interfere in a strictly ecclesiastical matter, as when an appeal was made to the Government against the decision of Bishop Wilson with reference to caste in the South Indian churches, or when, against the protest of Bishop Cotton, the Government insisted on the duty of chaplains to bury Roman Catholics whom their own Church had excommunicated, but in each case the Government withdrew on the Bishop's remonstrance, although in the latter case it was not until 1875 that the previous decision was reversed, at the instance of Bishop Cotton's successor. No one will pretend that this is the best form of Church government, but it would be simply unreal, and untrue, did we fail to recognise that there has been, especially since 1857, a genuine desire on the part of the State to co-operate with the Church and deal fairly by her, leaving her free to prosecute her own work in her own way. The extraordinary limitation clauses in the Acts of 1813 and 1833 have not, however objectionable they may be, superseded the Ordinal or prevented the Indian Bishops from fully acting up to their responsibilities as Bishops of the Church of Christ in a heathen land. One has only to turn to the short biographical sketch of the last Bishop of Calcutta, to which reference has already been made, to see how a State-appointed Bishop can identify himself with missionary work; and that this is no new idea is apparent from an interesting letter written by the late Bishop Sumner of Winchester (*Life*, p. 82) on the appointment of Heber to the see of Calcutta—a valuable evidence of contemporary English opinion on the responsibility of an Indian bishop. This practical point of view deserves serious attention, and now that with the concurrence of the authorities of the State coadjutor Bishops are being consecrated for Southern India, and new sees being founded for the Punjab and Burmah, and there seems every disposition on the part of the State to leave the Church unfettered, we may well be cautious of applying English or colonial experiences to a condition of things which has no exact parallel in any other country. It must be remembered that in many parts of India the Church is mainly represented at present by Europeans and by European officials, and any project for the increase of the episcopate which takes account only of natives of the country would offend against that which has been a cardinal principle of the Indian episcopate, viz., that it is to be a bond of union between Europeans and natives, between all souls of whatever race within the diocese,

distinctions of race being held, to quote the preface to Bishop Cotton's Charge for 1863, to be 'scarcely less fatal than those of caste, from which native believers are with difficulty delivered.'

Again, the Oriental conception of government is something so totally different from the Western idea that to force upon India the latest development of English liberal thought would be like putting new wine into old skins, to quote the Scriptural proverb. A king, according to the Indian conception, is a lord of the soil, the father of his people, and it is considered only natural and right that he should interest himself in the religious as well as the material interests of his subjects. An Eastern Government is not a mere framework to keep together the different elements of national life, but enters into every part of that national life, and is indeed inseparable from it. Hence, what has puzzled the natives of India has not been the connexion between the State and the Church, but rather the limited character of that connexion, not that the State has done so much to show its regard for religion, but that it has done so little. The natives regard the Government as their 'ma bap,' or father and mother, and so long as they are not compelled to change their religion, they consider it natural and right that the Government should show every possible regard for the religion which it believes to be true, and should hold it up as an example to the people. The extreme veneration shown by Hindoo and Mohammedan princes for such men as the late Bishop Milman is a remarkable proof of this, and it is a fact that the only natives who in any way object to the very moderate provision made by Government for its Christian servants, and to its very guarded recognition of Christianity, accompanied as it is by the largest religious toleration, are not orthodox and religious Hindoos, but men who have been imbued with certain phases of Western thought.

This intimate connexion between the State and the inner life of the people makes it of extreme importance that in all religious matters the Government should be able to turn to experienced and wise advisers, and the services which the Indian Bishops have thus been able to render to the country of their adoption have been again and again acknowledged. That the difficult question of the marriage of Christian converts was satisfactorily and finally settled by Indian legislation in 1866 was due in great measure to the wisdom of Bishop Cotton—a fact which no one, we believe, would be more willing than Sir Henry Maine, who introduced

the measure, to acknowledge. The services of Bishop Milman in like manner were so important that Lord Northbrook publicly stated the intention of the Government to place a memorial tablet in the Cathedral of Calcutta—an honour which, we believe, had not been paid by the State to any previous Bishop. These considerations are sufficient to make us hesitate before we apply to India conceptions and principles which may be right and true in England or the colonies, but which, when transplanted to the East, may be inapplicable and injurious.

The real thing to be contended for is that the Church should be free to develop in India, not on Western lines, but naturally and spontaneously, its organisation and its powers. Such a development Western prejudices may retard, but cannot, we believe, in the end prevent. The history of one age is the philosophy of the next, and the true wisdom of the Church will be to read the lessons for her guidance in the future in the chequered history of the past.

SHORT NOTICES.

Occasional Papers and Reviews. By JOHN KEBLE, M.A. (James Parker and Co., 1877.)

Constitutional Order, the Rightful Claim of the Church of England. A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. By the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1877.)

THE volume before us appears at a singularly opportune time, and its reprints of Mr. Keble's Tracts on the Gorham case, and of his article on the Exeter Synod, which appeared in the *Christian Remembrancer* in 1851, will be read with even more eagerness and interest now than on the occasion of their first appearance. Very rarely, indeed, we should imagine, has it ever happened that utterances elicited by a crisis so exciting and so anxious as that of 1850 have been so calm and wise, so true to principle and yet so free from all derangement of mental or moral balance, as these of Mr. Keble's. Still more rarely can it have happened that words so written, and under such circumstances, could so stand the test of time and be of such permanent value, that on the recurrence of a not dissimilar crisis nearly a whole generation afterwards, one has to say that they contain exactly the counsel which at the latter date is needed, as well as express exactly the principles which we wish to see followed out and adhered to. Yet so it is. Those 1850 and 1851 papers of Mr. Keble's now reprinted say almost everything we should wish to see set forth now in the spring of 1877, and they say it with the weight

of a great name, and with the further weight of having stood the test of time and not being the mere voice of the actual moment. We should hope that few of our readers have yet to make their acquaintance with these remarkable reprints.

But although the fact of the book having been out already for nearly three months must make it almost needless for us to introduce it to our readers, one or two remarks on the general subject may not be superfluous. The value of these reprints at the present juncture does not arise from their wisdom or their sound principle alone. They will serve to revive the recollections of 1850-1 in older men, and they will serve to enable younger men to realise with more distinctness than before the actual course of English Church history during the last thirty years. And this is precisely what is wanted at the existing moment. With the luckless proceedings of the P.W.R. with the judgment in the Ridsdale Appeal hanging over us, Churchmen who *are* Churchmen at all—that is to say, who believe that the Church is a spiritual corporation, with responsibilities which transcend those of a mere branch of the Civil Service, but who *also* have a concurrent regard for the historic position of the Church in England as an established portion of their country's constitution—such men, we say, are brought into a position of exceeding difficulty. Nothing, we conceive, or at least very few things, can be of greater service in the present difficulty than to get a little out of the dust of the conflict, to get a little above it, and to see the present deadlock in its relations to what has gone before, and how it is that we have reached it. Everybody is naturally saying, What next? Nothing helps you so efficiently to answer the question, What next? as a distinct understanding of the course by which you have come to where you are.

Now a careful study of Mr. Keble's papers will show even those who have no personal recollections of the time, (1) that bad as our present deadlock seems to be, the case is by no means so bad as it was in 1850-1; and (2) next, that judging by the analogy of the past, it is *not* so very difficult to divine the particular direction which ought now to be taken by those who can in any way influence the course of the great Church revival of the present century. Young soldiers for the first time under fire are naturally off their heads with excitement, and not only may, but must, be excused. Young Churchmen under the existing complications may in like manner be pardoned if they think that the present situation presents only an instantaneous alternative of immediate disestablishment or of committing the Church to formal Erastianism. We think nothing of the kind. See how things stood in 1850-1. See what we have gained since then. Thence infer what we ought to work for now, and go on steadily working for the Church's restoration to her due position, and then, if we *still* remain where we are when a fair trial has been given to the course so indicated, then, and not till then, begin to think the case is desperate.

The period which elicited these letters and papers of Mr. Keble's has well been called the ostensible Nadir of the Church of England. We say the *ostensible* Nadir,—or, to change the metaphor, the moment when her barometer *registered* lowest—for inwardly she had turned the

corner years before. In the history of states and of communities, the period when the high or the low water mark gets registered in the visible external sphere of events and history is always somewhat in arrear of the actual fact. So it was then. The Church had turned the corner and was on the mend. The future historian of the Church will point to 1850-1 as the moment of her lowest visible fortunes. It is singular how many unpleasant incidents were concentrated upon these and the few preceding years. The exact date itself marks the period when by illusory returns the Nonconformists managed to delude the world into the idea of a numerical importance altogether unreal and fictitious, but upon which they have traded ever since, although even then their relative importance had begun to wane, and though they have taken good care to prevent any fresh census being taken to correct the misrepresentation. Just before, the Minister of the day had imposed a *Bishop* on the Church, whose orthodoxy was impeached and against whom half the English Episcopate protested. Then came the Gorham case, when the secular power imposed a *priest* upon a diocese against all the efforts of his diocesan, and without it being so much as *possible* for the Church at large to utter a remonstrance. Such is a picture of the surroundings amid which Mr. Keble penned the remarkable papers which this volume reproduces. The question is, What light do these facts, taken along with the history of the subsequent quarter of a century, throw upon our present duty and our future efforts?

Let us look at the matter both internally and externally. Internally, every discouraging blow of that dark time has been followed by a distinct revival in respect of the doctrine or the practice then disparaged. The practical denial of the doctrine of Baptism in the Gorham judgment marks the period since which the return of that doctrine to its proper place in the Church's system has been continuous and unbroken. And the same may be said of every department of the Church's interior work and action. Externally, it has been the period of the revival of Convocation and of its recognition—a recognition tardy, grudging, and ungracious, no doubt, on the part of the civil power, but of which the very grudgingness with which it has been granted is a measure of the force by which it has been extorted. And what we submit is, first of all, that the single fact of the revival of Convocation makes all the difference between the crisis of 1877 and that of 1850-1. There is a sense in which we may say that this revival of Convocation, so far as it has gone, is the exterior fruit of the difficulties of 1851, just as the dogmatic revival of which we have spoken is its interior fruit. It took twenty years of hard work to bring that revival of Convocation up to its present, still very imperfect stage; but it has been done, and the fact that it has been done (1) shows us that the difficulties of that period were not unblessed to us, and (2) indicates to us on what lines to move now that we are undergoing a renewal—not to say repetition—of the same deadlock as before.

It is the more instructive, because the crisis of 1850-1 led to two parallel lines of most persistent effort and endeavour on the part of

the Church's champions and representatives. Of these the one concerned her legislative, the other her judicial system. Of the former we have already spoken; Convocation *has* been revived. As to the latter, thus far we have had no success at all. And yet, six-and-twenty years ago, with Bishops Blomfield and Wilberforce making their resolute efforts to amend the Court of Final Appeal, any one would have predicted exactly the reverse. *Now* any far-seeing man would say that the failure of those two energetic prelates was the best thing that could have happened, for it turns out to be the continued pressure of the utter incapacity of our judicial system which keeps driving us on in the only direction in which real reform can be achieved,—that, namely, of the Church's legislative organ. The utter and total suppression of the Church's corporate life, with which the present century opened, demanded a far more searching and thorough reform and reorganisation than any mere improvement, however well meant, of a court which rested upon no intelligible basis whatever. Had those efforts succeeded, they could only have been a palliative, and might only have checked the larger and more important move for the revival of the Church's legislature.

What then is the upshot of all this? Briefly it is as follows: that our existing complication is the Number 2 of that of which 1850-1 was Number 1; that as the former has been followed by a distinct step in advance, so also we may reasonably expect the latter to be in its turn; that the experience acquired since 1850-1 points clearly to an advance in the direction of the revival of the old constitutional relations of Convocation with the civil Legislature, and to the postponement of all questions regarding the reform in the judicial department until the prior question of the legislative has been advanced at least a stage or two. It is no light matter that we are entering upon. Convocation wants reforming as well as restoring to its old constitutional position. Time, patience, and long-sustained energy will be sorely needed in the carrying out of the next stage of the work which was commenced when first the permission to meet at all for discussion was extorted from the Government of Lord Aberdeen, and from the still more unwilling Primate, Archbishop J. B. Sumner; and of which the first stage, but the first stage only, was achieved when first letters of business were accorded to Convocation.

It must not be supposed that this volume of remains contains nothing else than Mr. Keble's papers on the crisis of 1850. There is much else both of high interest and of enduring value. But the singular opportuneness of the reappearance of these papers at the very moment when they could be of the greatest service has led us to speak at length regarding them, and the more so as for many reasons we have felt it best to defer our more detailed and comprehensive review of the whole situation until we shall have before us the decision in the Ridsdale Appeal now pending. We feel that we cannot close these cursory remarks better than by quoting the following paragraph from Mr. T. T. Carter's Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in which, it is needless to say, we fully concur, and which, we hope, will be in the hands of all Churchmen:—

'In conclusion I would remind your Grace of two important facts in the recent history of the English people.

'Twice within our memory England has been brought to the verge of a revolution: once through an insurrectionary spirit aroused by the disproportionate representation of the people in the House of Commons; the other time, through a similar spirit caused by the artificial restrictions upon commerce, resulting in the dearth and consequent scarcity of food. In the first case, the disturbance was calmed, and the danger averted, by a truer adaptation of our representative system to the increase and changes which had taken place in the population since its original settlement. In the other case, the distress was removed and peace restored by a more enlightened regard to the laws which determine the wealth of nations, the surplus produce of one country being intended to supply the deficiency of another. In both cases the remedy was the same; it was found in having recourse to constitutional principles; in the one case, by reform grounded on a truer regard to the principles of our popular government; in the other, by a relaxation of restraints, grounded on principles of a higher order—the laws of the good providence of God.

'I would express my conviction that the unhappy disorder and imminent danger now affecting the Church of England can, by God's blessing, be remedied only by similar means, viz. by having regard to the principles of her constitution.'

While these lines are going through the press, we understand that his Grace has issued a reply to Mr. Carter's Letter, but as no copy of it has yet reached us, we are unable to do more than state the fact.

An Introduction to the History of the successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer. (James Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1877.)

To review this book in detail or to do anything like justice either to the value of its contents or to the extraordinary labour and skilful pains bestowed on it by its compiler would require a lengthy and extended article. Its chief importance lies in the completeness of its documentary information as to the course of the last Revision of all, that namely under Charles II. Here Mr. Parker has given us not merely the official history, if we may so call it, of the several stages of the work, but also what we may term the secret history of the modifications which the book underwent—the proposals for modification with all their own successive modifications, prior to their emerging into the open day of formal discussion before the official Revisers. This is done by giving also a full and accurate comparison of Cosin's corrected copy of 1640-61, and of Sancroft's fair copy of 1661. Then, in addition, so as to make still more clear the *rationale* of the suggestions in Bishop Cosin's book, illustrative extracts are given from time to time from the notes in Cosin's interleaved Prayer-Book, already well known as printed in the Appendix to Nicholls on the Prayer-Book, 1710. Besides these, we may mention Mr. Parker's general and historical surveys of Cosin's corrections, and of the work of the last Revision, and his history of the Act of Uniformity. There can be no doubt that now at last there need be no difficulty about tracing the real history and drift of every disputed word and phrase in our Offices, and that what up to this date could

not be done at all without consulting various libraries, may now be done by the simple act of reference to Mr. Parker's convenient and intelligible volume.

The Orthodox Doctrine of the Church of England. Explained in a Commentary on the XXXIX. Articles, by the Rev. THOMAS ISAAC BALL. With an Introduction by the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Vicar of Froome Selwood. (Rivingtons.)

'THE following treatise,' says Mr. Bennett, in his introductory dissertation, 'is meant, not for divines, or such as would plunge into the deeper studies of theology, but such as would desire to form for themselves a connected and rational view,' &c. &c. That is a modest description, and the work fairly answers to it. It is neither philosophical nor specially learned, but the writer usually takes an intelligent view of the articles he deals with. It is hardly thoroughgoing enough for a manual to be used by theological classes. It never, so far as we have seen, exhausts its subjects, and is a little inclined to be extreme in doctrinal statement. But it is well-intentioned, and has a Catholic tone from beginning to end, and deserves a word of commendation.

We regret to say that Mr. Bennett has written his introductory letter too hastily and without sufficient consideration of the bearing of the principles he puts forth, or even of the correctness of the statements he makes. It will scarcely be credited that the very first sentence of his letter contains three distinct and not unimportant mistakes. He sets out by stating that the 'first idea' of promulgating doctrinal articles is due to Henry VIII., who put forth articles 'of his own' in 1536, and which were known under the name of the 'Six Articles.' Now the fact is, that they were not Henry's 'own,' but composed by Convocation; they were *ten*, and not *six*; and the well-known 'Six Articles' were published in 1539 and not in 1536. Then it may be further remarked that the idea apparently held by Mr. Bennett, and upon which he enlarges at considerable length, viz. that there is something *new* and unwonted about the attempt to restrain doctrinal variation by imposing 'articles of religion,' is altogether unfounded. 'Article' in the ecclesiastical sense is very nearly equivalent to 'canon'; these latter, as we need not remind Mr. Bennett, might be either disciplinary or doctrinal; and whether it be true, or no, that they were employed to restrain variations of opinion, if they have failed, their failure is no special reproach to the English Church, for they have failed in common with every canon of every Council that has assembled since Nicæa. But our own view is otherwise. We hold that it was *their own* doctrinal position, at least as much as that of other people, the Reformers were anxious about; and that they were desirous to have some doctrinal standard to which they could point, a battle-flag to which their forces might rally. And they did their best to make that flag as acceptable as possible to all but the extreme sections.

Then there is the further consideration, which is far more important, that truth—doctrinal truth we mean—*has always the aspect of*

compromise, because it is, in fact, the point of contact between truths apparently antinomous and antagonistic—the resultant from the mutual action of combining forces in the spiritual sphere. It would be interesting to show this in detail; but it is sufficient if we have indicated some of the legitimate causes which occasion the Articles to put on the aspect of compromise. Others no doubt there were, owing to the special circumstances of the times, but into these we cannot now enter. We could wish that Mr. Bennett would, for his own sake, rewrite this hasty and inaccurate letter; but *littera scripta manet*.

Charges, Speeches, &c. By H. MOORE, Archdeacon of Stafford and Canon Residentiary of Lichfield. Edited by his WIDOW. (London: Skeffington and Son, 1877.)

THIS volume has a very considerable value apart from its interest to all the numerous friends of the late Archdeacon. Its contents may be roughly divided into those concerning the diocese of Lichfield and those which concern the Church of England at large. In each case they are valuable, (1) as contributions to contemporary history; and (2) as recording the opinions of a man of sound judgment, ample information, and consistent churchmanship. Archdeacon Moore was a High Churchman before the Tractarian movement, and therefore represents the not very numerous but not the less important and admirable class of men who—more than a younger generation is apt to think,—kept alive the sacred flame of Church principles when few cared for its shining. The book is well worth publishing and well worth reading. Our only regret is that it has no index of subjects—a very grave defect where the topics handled are so numerous and so multifarious. We should not wonder if it reaches a (well-deserved) second edition. If so, this omission ought to be supplied.

A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects, and Doctrines. Being a continuation of the *Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and HENRY WACE, M.A., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London, Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Vol. I. A—D. (London: John Murray, 1877.)

WE should hardly like to say how many Biographical Dictionaries are in existence. It must be a considerable number; and yet it is unquestionably true that such a work as a Dictionary of Biography for Church purposes has still to be written. Partial and sectional Biographies have no doubt been attempted. Herzog's *Realencyclopædie* and Winer's *Realwörterbuch* are works in every sense great. The Abbé Migne's *Dictionnaire de Biographie Chrétienne et Antichrétienne* is in various ways a respectable instalment of such a work. Du Pin's collections are really stupendous as the work of one man, and, what is still better, they may be trusted: but only a part of them consists of Biography. The 'Biography' division of the *English Encyclopædia* is serious and honourable in all it says; but it is far too brief in its lives of Churchmen, and it does not profess to take that peculiarly ecclesiastical point of view which is

absolutely needful (we speak advisedly) to the creation of a work which shall be useful to the point of ideal completeness. Of smaller works, such as that of the late Dean Hook, thoroughly well-intentioned as many of these last are, we do not speak. They belong to a different class. And it has not unfrequently happened to ourselves to search for, and to find, in the *Biographie Universelle* the confirmation or disproof of some fact in the life of an ecclesiastic which was obtainable in none of the others. Now that work (*Biographie Universelle*) cannot be called, in any sense, a popular or even a generally accessible work.

We not only, therefore, admit the opportuneness of this enterprise, of which the first volume is before us, but we welcome it with acclamation. There is quite room in English literature for a work of the kind, and the conductors (speaking in the most general sense) will confer a great benefit upon the English Church and clergy indeed, but specifically upon students whose knowledge is confined to their mother tongue, by projecting and carrying through a Dictionary of Christian Biography, in which the same patient industry, the same scrupulous fairness, the same paramount regard for the interests of historical truth is maintained, as in previous members of this important series.

And yet it is by no means a perfect dictionary: it does not even aim at this. The plan of the work is not to be 'a complete *onomasticon* of the Christian world for the first eight centuries.' That, it was found, was unattainable within the limits (we must suppose) which time of production or conditions of size imposed. The more modest plan (but also, as it may prove, the less enduring) was determined on, of making a *digest* and translation into English of the encyclopædic labours of great Continental scholars. It may be well, however, to allow the Editors to speak for themselves:—

'The labours of great foreign scholars since the Reformation, particularly of Baronius, of Tillemont, of Ceillier, and of more recent French and German authors, have brought together nearly all the primary materials for the general Church history of our period; and similarly grand collections have been made for the Church history of particular nations. It was thought that if these labours were taken as our starting point, and if an effort were made to ensure that all the materials afforded in these voluminous collections were verified, utilised, and brought within practical compass, we should at least have carried the work done by our predecessors an important step forward, and should have placed within the reach of general readers whatever is essential to the study of Church history.'

There can be but one opinion as to whether this comparatively limited aim has been satisfactorily realised; and however scholars may sigh over the just visible ideal Dictionary which the Editors have failed to give them, there can be no doubt that for the large majority of students, and 'for practical purposes' as they say, they have produced one of the most useful works of this generation.

We cannot profess to have examined all through a work which occupies 914 closely printed octavo pages. But we have read many of the articles and critically studied some; and are fully confirmed

thereby in our persuasion of their generally reliable character. Among the more noticeable articles are 'Apocalypses (Apocryphal),' by Professor Lipsius, which contains a good deal of curious learning; a very long and most admirable one on 'Athanasius,' by Canon Bright; and on 'Coptic Church,' also 'Donatism,' by Mr. J. M. Fuller. Dr. Benson's elaborate life of 'Cyprianus' has too much the look of a review article, and judges Cyprian instead of merely telling his story. There is a good account appended to the article, of the bibliography of the subject (after Harter). It is curious to notice how, after 'Ceolfred' had been treated by the very competent hands of Canon Raine, it has been taken up again and treated with considerable interest and picturesque detail by Mr. Hole. But what he means by Ceolfred 'yielding himself to this tide' (p. 441), we cannot imagine; and he is too hard on Ceolfred now and then. *Adorasse* does not of necessity mean 'worshipped'; if it did, the veneration would not be 'sensuous' worship; and, finally, he has made nonsense of the quotation from Bede by omitting all reference to 'the holy places of the blessed apostles at Rome,' which words are required to complete the meaning.

We differ, with some reluctance, from so deservedly high an authority as Professor Stubbs; but is he not wrong in his article on 'Bertha,' in concluding that she was married to Athelberht *after* the death of her mother Ingeberga, which seems unlikely, and contradicts Bede? 'Clemens Romanus' is by Dr. Salmon, of Trinity College, Dublin, and is somewhat cold and critical; but naturally that is what is expected and required in an encyclopædia. It appears to us, however, that his view of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians is wanting in definiteness. Why was it written? he does not even suggest any answer. It is perfectly true, as he states, that the terms 'bishop' and 'presbyter' are used convertibly as in the New Testament. But the succeeding statement, that 'there is no trace that in the Church of Corinth one presbyter had any very pronounced authority over the rest,' is so made as to mislead. Was not this because of the vacancy of the see? That supposition explains the facts; it provides an occasion and a *dignus vindice nodus* for the interposition of so considerable a person as Clement, and his vindication of the three orders of the ministry; which is the precise thing that Dr. Salmon does not seem to see the want of.

We had marked other points, but must occupy no more space. The whole work, as far as it has hitherto gone, is fair, scholarly, and to be trusted. We argue well for its success.

Mohammed and Mohammedanism. Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in February and March 1874. By R. BOSWORTH SMITH, M.A. Second Edition, revised and enlarged. (Smith, Elder, and Co.)

THE writer of these Lectures has happened upon an unfortunate time of publication. Religions, like philosophies and like individuals, must be judged by their fruits; and the nations of Europe have been lately engaged in judging the fruits of the Mohammedan religion, and have

found them very bad indeed—veritable apples of the Dead Sea. Therefore it would seem that the time is ill chosen for perfectly unmeasured glorification of Islam and its founder Mohammed. The logic of facts is against the lecturer; and under these circumstances it might seem superfluous for us to do more than just call attention to this practical refutation of an imposing theory. It is needless at this time of day to tell the world that any religion which lives and grows and spreads itself among men is thereby proved to have some truth in it that elevates men's souls and some good that consoles them. The moral nature of man cannot live upon a lie *sans phrase*. This, we say, is so recognised as to have become a truism; and this, or something indistinguishable from this, appears to be the residual truth which Mr. Bosworth Smith's Lectures, when duly sifted, prove to contain. They are full of audacious and incomplete statements. By way of compensation, we presume, to Mohammed and his system for having been unduly depreciated by Christian writers in times past, Mr. Bosworth Smith attempts to redress the balance by an equally undue laudation, in which he elaborately compares Mohammedanism with Christianity, by no means invariably to the advantage of the latter. But the counter-argument lies near at hand. It would be not at all difficult to show that the religion of Mohammed avoids failures in the moral training of its votaries by avoiding the attempt so to train them; that if its creed is simple, it is because it is incomplete and inadequate; that it ignores the great and pressing problems of life; and finds a ready means of suppressing the troublesome inquisitiveness of the mind by indulging the most degrading passions of the body to the very top of their bent.

But, in truth, we do not propose to traverse in detail the argument of Mr. Bosworth Smith's Lectures. Their merits are extreme candour and breadth of mind; clearness of statement and a charming style. Their faults are an excessive and too indiscriminating partisanship; an incomplete induction of particulars, which enables the writer to give too favourable views of Islam: a disposition to exaggerate the good and neglect the evil in the personal character of Mohammed and the system which he founded. The fact is, Mr. Bosworth Smith has accustomed himself so long to look at religions, his own included, from the merely philosophical and comparative point of view, that he would seem to have almost forgotten that of the *believer*. It must ever be a fatal error to attempt to demonstrate the truth or the value of Christianity merely *from the outside*; and that is the position which our contemporary apostles of comparative religion, and among them Mr. Bosworth Smith, habitually take up.

The spectacle, then, which the Mohammedan religion is affording to the world at present is that of a sovereignty which is well-nigh helpless and an empire which is on the verge of ruin. And it is not merely the dwindling into helplessness of a single race, the Turkish race, which we see—it is the self-contrived *reductio ad absurdum* of the Mohammedan religion. The religious difficulty has created the political one. If the various races which com-

pose the Turkish empire had been Christian, a *modus vivendi* would have been possible, and would doubtless long since have been found. But it is the incompatibility of Islam with progress and with modern civilisation that causes the present paralysis of the Turkish power. While Islam had its way entirely, a government of some kind was possible. It meant cruelty and oppression to the subject populations, especially if they were Christian, but it provided a government after its kind, one of the worst of despotisms, but still a government. But Islam *cannot improve*. It dooms the national mind of Turkey, like every other which has embraced it, to entire immobility. The Turkish Government has promised over and over again to grant equal rights to the Christians under its rule. In the *Hatti-Scheriffs* and *Hatti-Humayouns* of 1853 and 1860, and it would be long to count how many times besides, redress of past wrongs and equal rights for the future were promised to Christians. Not one of those promises has been kept. And why? Because the Koran forbids equality between the Mussulman and those of any other faith. The Sultan may issue proclamations, but they are quietly disregarded; and so it will always be, as it has always been. The Koran is library, code of law, and Rule of Faith in one; and the Koran forbids any change.

These facts form a significant commentary upon Mr. Bosworth Smith's encomiums of this singular book. We find it hard to understand his enthusiasm for it. It has indeed some passages of poetical beauty and rough vigour. He has given, on p. 179, perhaps the finest passage in the book as a specimen. But its apodosis is lamentably weak; and very few passages could be found at all comparable in merit even to this. The generality of the Suras are full of tautology and repetition, dull and insipid in the extreme.

The lecturer's treatment, in Lecture iii. (p. 188), of the question of miracles as between Islam and Christianity, seems to us, on the whole, unsatisfactory. The fact is undeniable, that Mohammed performed no miracles. This may have been, as one school of reasoners says, because he could not, and that he would have done so if he could; while another may see in the fact a proof of his intellectual elevation above the common cravings of mankind. It was open to the lecturer to take, as he has taken, the second of these hypotheses; but he was unwarranted in going on to put the whole question of miracles on a false ground, in order thereby to obscure the difference to which he has himself borne witness between Islam and Christianity. This is not the place in which to discuss the question of miracles at length; but we may remark that his dictum on p. 188, that in proportion as exact knowledge advances, the sphere of the supernatural is narrowed, is either so trite a truism as to have been scarcely worth enunciating, or it contains the *suggestio falsi* that a belief in 'the supernatural' rests only on the ignorance of man and disappears as the sphere of his knowledge widens; or in the 'religious instinct,' which, in a still more objectionable passage he assures his readers, 'will find without, or supply from its own resources [italics ours], the verities with which it deals,' and so, 'in a word, supply the soul with the supreme objects for its worship and its aspirations'—(p. 189). We could wish to sup-

pose that this language simply means that the religious instinct apprehends the idea of God and the supernatural, and not that it originates them. But we have heard too much of this sort of talk before. We must do Mr. Bosworth Smith the justice of allowing that there is not a great deal of it in his Lectures; but what there is we think mistaken and in bad taste; and the ultimate suggestion that Christians should welcome Mohammedanism as a religious system, little, if in anything, inferior to their own, seems to us to show a palpable misjudgment of the facts, only to be accounted for by the thoroughgoing partisanship for Islam which he has chosen to assume.

One more instance of that incorrectness of statement which we have already remarked upon we will extract from p. 336, where he observes: 'In other Mussulman countries (*i.e.* other than India) the intolerant principles of the Koran have long since been reconciled, except when there is a passing outburst of fanaticism, with the utmost practical toleration.' And this whilst no Christian dares to travel through Morocco or Tunis; and whilst the legal penalty throughout the Turkish Empire for a Mohammedan deserting Islam and becoming a Christian is *death*, both to the man converted and his converter. He may perhaps say that the legal penalty is never enforced; but Mr. Denton's book leads us to believe that there may have been more martyrdoms under the Turkish rule than the world has any idea of; even if we forbear to speak of the hanging of the Patriarch of Constantinople, or of the impalements in Bosnia, of which we have heard from Canon Liddon and Mr. Mac Coll. It is happily true, that the perpetrators of Cretan, Damascene, Bulgarian massacres are now in no condition to repeat their exploits. But when once Islam loses the power of the scimitar, it will be in a bad way. And, on the whole, as we began by saying, its apologist has fallen on evil days.

Christianity and Islam. The Bible and the Koran. Four Lectures.

By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, Prebendary of Chichester. (Bentley, 1877.)

A CLEAR, well-informed, and dispassionate survey of the inherent and the practical differences between the Christian and the Mohammedan systems. Mr. Stephens has read up his subject with much pains and care, and gives the results of his study in a very pleasing and intelligible form. Those who have not time or opportunity for consulting larger works, and so studying both sides of the question, will find a really reliable outline of the whole subject in these comprehensive and very readable Lectures, which are presented in the following order:—I. A Sketch of the Life and Character of Mohammed, so as to contrast the *origins* of the Christian and Mohammedan systems. II. The contrast between their Theological systems. III. The contrast between their Moral Teachings. IV. The contrast between their Practical Results.

The Psalms. With Introductions and Critical Notes. By Rev. A. C. JENNINGS, M.A., assisted in part by Rev. W. H. LOWE, M.A. Pss. I.—lxxii. (Macmillan and Co., 1877.)

FOR thoroughness of annotation, clearness, and general soundness of

judgment in weighing conflicting arguments, we think very highly of this book, and consider it to be quite *the* book for the English student of the Psalms, although sometimes—as can hardly help being the case—we doubt the author's conclusions. The Prolegomena and General Introduction, some sixty closely printed pages, are very able and full of closely packed and clearly stated information. Our only hesitation here is as to the extent to which the writers minimise the predictive element in the Psalter. No doubt one must make some allowance on the score of *reaction* in the case of young writers who set out with the (laudable) determination of grappling to the utmost with the difficulties of the primary historic significance of the several Psalms which go to make up the collection. Hitherto the tendency has been all the other way; to ignore the historical and to exalt the predictive. But we cannot help thinking that if Messrs. Jennings and Lowe had as minute and searching a knowledge of the Gospels and some of S. Paul's Epistles as they have of the Psalter—of the way in which these last seem to be almost built up out of Psalter materials—they could hardly go the length they do in their minimising. And we observe that they assign three Psalms to the Maccabaean period.

Spiritual Letters of Archbishop Fénelon. Letters to Men. Translated by the Author of Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai, &c. &c. (Rivingtons, 1877.)

CLERGY and Laity alike will welcome this volume. Fénelon's religious counsels have always seemed to us to present the most remarkable combination of high principle and practical common-sense, and now in this English dress it is really wonderful how little of the *aroma* of their original expression has evaporated. Elder clergy will delight in comparing their own experiences with Fénelon's ways of treating the several classes of cases here taken in hand. To younger clergy it will be quite a series of specimen examples how to deal with that which is daily becoming a larger and larger department of the practical work of any really efficient clergyman. And laymen will find it so straightforward and intelligible, so utterly free from technicality, and so entirely sympathetic with a layman's position, that we hope it will be largely bought and read among them. A more useful work has rarely been done than giving these letters to English readers.

A Commentary on the Epistles and Gospels in the Book of Common Prayer. Extracted from writings of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the Division of the East and West, by a Lay Member of the Church. With an Introductory Notice by the Dean of St. Paul's. Two vols. (James Parker and Co.)

COMPARATIVELY few persons have the slightest adequate idea of the rich stores of devotional reading which are to be found in the works of the Catholic Fathers. And the number of 'lay members' who have given themselves the trouble to search through their voluminous works must be very small indeed. We fear that in many

libraries Clark's *Foreign Theological* is taking the place of the *Library of the Fathers*, and the modern *neo-Catholic* Germans of the ancient Greeks and Italians.

All the more honour therefore to this Abdiel among laymen who has put forth a series of extracts so well chosen and maintained. By no class of men will it be more welcomed—to no class will it be so useful—as the clergy themselves. The great bulk of the extracts are from SS. Chrysostom and Augustine: two men indeed whose match as homilists it would be hard to find. But the works of SS. Cyril, Athanasius, the Gregories, and others, have also been laid under contribution; and the readings thus brought together are the very *crème de la crème*, the very gold of gold of spiritual exposition. A great omission is that of an index of the passages employed from each particular Father, which would guide the reader in finding what he wanted.

We must not omit to give its due meed of praise to the brief but striking introduction which Dean Church has prefixed to the volumes. It is concerned a good deal with the general question of Bible study, and we have seldom read anything more beautiful than the analysis, on p. xii., of the source of the peculiar power and excellence of the Fathers as commentators on Scripture. The Dean is *perfectly* right, and we do not think that the reason has ever been so felicitously expressed as in this passage. We could wish to go more fully into the question,—and we could wish also to transfer the passage we refer to bodily to our own columns,—in neither of which natural impulses can we indulge ourselves at this present.

The Mystery of Suffering. Six Lectures by the Rev. S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. (Skeffington and Son, London, 1877.)

THIS is the very Poetry of Theology, by which we do not mean that the Theology is sublimated away by the Poetry, but only illustrated by it, and a very difficult subject very beautifully handled.

The Foreign Church Chronicle and Review. Published Quarterly. W. WELLS GARDNER. No. 1. March 1877.

THE days are gone by when it could be said that the English nation was so self-absorbed that it really thought that the Saviour suffered for the English alone; yet, though we may have become more cosmopolitan and less exclusive, it is questionable whether our genuine knowledge of things beyond our shores is so considerable or so accurate as it should be. The object of this new and most promising periodical is to keep us up to the mark in respect of the religious affairs and interests of other countries as well as our own. Its scope is wide enough in all conscience. It aims at being not merely Pan-Anglican, but absolutely universal in its survey; and in this its first number we have articles respecting France, Germany, Mexico, Bulgaria, Armenia, Corfu, and Switzerland, while minor notices take us also into North America, Italy, Spain, Chaldaea, and Japan. Some Correspondence and Reviews are also added. We heartily wish our new contemporary a wide circulation, a long life, and the good luck to secure bright and engaging writers.